

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

LUTHARDT ON CONVERSION.

BY REV. CHAS. E. HAY, D. D.

No thoughtful student of church history has failed to deplore the disastrous consequences traceable to the misuse of scriptural language. Especially liable to perversion are the terms employed to describe the various stages and aspects of the process by which man becomes the actual possessor of the blessings proffered in the gospel. Modern methods of evangelizing effort have attached to the word Conversion a narrow and utterly inadequate meaning in the popular mind and led to the charge, passed from lip to lip, that the Lutheran Church does not believe in conversion. Perhaps her pastors, in their anxiety to avoid giving countenance to superficial conceptions of the religious life, have at times been too ready to abandon the use of the term itself in their ministrations, thus needlessly surrendering a part of their Christian and Lutheran birthright. Such timidity would be deplorable in view of the overwhelming practical importance of the change in spiritual condition and prospects which, under any theory, is in some way involved in the term. All the divine benefits bestowed upon man cannot avail for his salvation unless he be "converted," Matt. 18 : 3. The provisions of God's grace must be appropriated and man must be radically changed thereby. Yet it is possible to express all that is involved in the term, Conversion, in a combination of other terms, or by using them separately with an expansion of their

primary significance. This was actually done in the era of the Reformation, as it had been done before by the Apostles. The truth is, that the Lutheran Church demands conversion of the most radical and fundamental sort, and looks with amazement and horror upon the shallow views of those who ring the changes upon the term itself, while allowing the ignorance and conceit of the thoughtless multitude to mark the limitations of its meaning.

It is the purpose of the present paper to present the views of one of the most eminent of living Lutheran theologians, Dr. Christoph Ernst Luthardt, upon this topic, as condensed in two of his works not accessible in complete English dress, *i. e.*, his "*Kompendium der Dogmatik*" (1886), and his "*Glaubenslehre*" (1898). The peculiar fitness of Dr. Luthardt to speak upon such a theme will not be questioned. His world-wide reputation as a broad-minded and thoroughly reverent theologian rests upon the most solid foundation. The versatility of his mind and variety of his labors have fitted him to view a subject of this character in every light. For half a century in the chair of a theological professor lecturing upon systematic theology and New Testament exegesis, for nearly forty years editing leading theological journals of Germany, a pulpit orator swaying multitudes by his intensely practical appeals and reaching a wider congregation through numerous volumes of published sermons and through a series of substantial works unexcelled in their lucid exposition of the fundamental truths of Christianity and unrivalled in their popularity, a philosopher wrestling boldly with the great problems of free will and grace so deeply involved in the transformation of sinner into saint,—we feel that he, if any man, is entitled to voice the convictions of the great Lutheran communion upon the doctrine of Conversion.

In both the works before us we find the topic embedded in the general discussion of the personal appropriation of salvation. Under this general subject are first treated the works of the Holy Spirit in Calling and Enlightening. Where these divine offices are not disregarded, we may trace in the recipient a process

of inner transformation, in which it may not always be an easy task to define the limits of divine and human agency.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION.

"Although the Holy Spirit exerts a moral influence upon man in many ways, even while in the state of nature, yet it is only through the gracious renewing agency of the Holy Spirit operating upon his inner volitional life that man is enabled and inclined to turn from sin to God in conversion. This inner process, necessary to salvation in every case, is accordingly made possible only through such gracious agency; and only upon the basis of such agency and by its power can the process reach its consummation through the voluntary decision of man's inner nature.

"The Scriptures describe conversion partly as a work of grace and partly as a work accomplished by man himself. The Old Testament presents it as a work of grace when giving the promise of a new heart and recording earnest prayers for its bestowal, Jer. 24 : 7 ; Ez. 11 : 19, 36 : 26 ; Ps. 51 : 12. The same view is clearly involved in the New Testament when it demands the new birth as an absolutely new beginning of life effected in us by the spirit of God, Jn. 3 : 3 ff., describing renewal as an awakening from the dead, Eph. 2 : 5 ; Col. 2 : 13, and ascribing the whole (work) to grace, I. Cor. 4 : 7, 15 : 10—to grace moreover as working upon man's inward nature and giving new volition, Phil. 1 : 6, 2 : 13 ; or when repentance, Acts 5 : 31, 11 : 18 ; II. Tim. 2 : 25, or faith (Jn. 6 : 29 is here quoted by the Dogmaticians) Eph. 1 : 19. 2 : 10, is ascribed to the divine agency and designated a work of God. On the other hand, repentance and faith are required of man as his own doing—"repent and believe"—at every stage of divine revelation. It is represented that he who hears the divine call should and can immediately obey, Ps. 95 : 7 f.; Heb. 4 : 7 ff., and faith is an obedience freely rendered by man, Rom. 1 : 5. Conversion thus appears also (even in Jer. 31 : 18, the passage chiefly relied upon by our old theologians) as man's own deed, on which account *ἐπιστρέφειν* is used only in the active and middle, never in the

passive voice. The key to the harmonizing of the two classes of passages lies in the inwardly renewing agency of the Holy Spirit, which accompanies the divine word addressed to man, Jn. 6 : 44 ; Lk. 24 : 32 ; Acts 2 : 37, 16 : 14, so that, upon the basis of this divine agency exerted upon him, man may assume either a receptive or a hostile attitude toward the Word, Matt. 23 : 37 ; Jn. 5 : 40, 17 : 6, 8." Komp. p. 254.

THE NECESSITY OF CONVERSION.

"The burden of John the Baptist's message and of the preaching of Christ which immediately followed, was like that of the ancient prophets: Become of a different mind, *i. e.*, be converted. The whole revealed plan of salvation, indeed, and especially the mission of Christ himself, must be regarded as a gift bestowed upon man by God; yet the revelation thus made approaches man as a demand, and that a moral demand upon the personal mind and will. It is not new disclosures of certain realms of interesting knowledge which grace offers to bestow, nor quieting sensations and frames of mind, but it is a moral demand, or challenge, addressed to the moral personality in its relation to God. There must be a change in this relation. Christian piety is a demeanor and a demand for such demeanor, not a form of mystical enjoyment. It is moreover, a personal demeanor toward God, since what we call Christianity is personal fellowship with God. The process by which we become Christians must therefore be an inner process within the depths of our own personal moral life, and cannot be merely applied to us in some way without our own personal participation. Sin, which constitutes the actual moral state of man, is alienation of the conscious volition from God. To be a Christian, on the contrary, is to stand in personal fellowship of mind and will with God. The inner process, therefore, through which we become Christians must consist in a transformation of our personal, conscious volitional life from the state of alienation from God into that of fellowship with God, *i. e.*, in a "change of mind" (heart). That is to say, we transfer to God the centre of gravity of our whole inner life and in him secure it again. Thus it was the very essence

of the sin of our first parents, that they ceased to be theocentric; and the same may be said of every sin. Hence the Word of God addresses the personal mind and will of man in the divine summons to turn back again to God—renouncing on the one hand all that is opposed to God, and on the other hand pledging itself to God. Such is the demand made upon all men." Glaubensl., p. 439.

ARE ANY EXEMPT FROM THE NEED OF CONVERSION?

"Must every one be converted? Even those who have been baptized? Is not baptism the divine covenant in which God forgives man's sin and receives him to the fellowship of his grace? And is not baptism also associated with the renunciation of the devil and all his works and with a pledge of fealty to God, and does it not thus involve and give expression to both aspects of conversion itself? And even though we practice baptism in infancy, when there can from the nature of the case be no thought of conversion, yet are we fully persuaded that even infant baptism is not a mere external ceremony or custom of the Church, but a work of God, wrought upon the soul of the child—a work of God, moreover, in which the Holy Spirit effects the beginning of a new life in the soul of the baptized, both a new relation of fellowship and peace with God and the laying of the foundation for a new attitude and demeanor of the actual life toward God—a spiritual parallel thus to the natural birth in its relation to the natural life. But this work of God requires to be taken up by us into our own awakening volitional life and made the personal act of this new individual life. That which baptism by the act of God bestows and effects does not therefore release us from, but on the contrary obligates us to, a corresponding personal demeanor in a change of mind (heart). This may assume various forms according as the individual has remained more or less under the influence of what we designate baptismal grace or has fallen from it. But even though one should have borne himself so correctly as, *e. g.*, Spener, who when interrogated by Canstein as to the sins of his youth could recall only the one fault, that he had, when about twelve years

old, allowed himself to be persuaded to join in a round dance at a public frolic in his merry Alsacian home—even then must every one renounce complicity with the sin abounding on every hand and declare his allegiance to God; and every one must attain an inward personal decision against Satan and for God. And as long as we live in the flesh, must this affirmation and negation continue and be repeated; for we shall all through life be subject to the influence of sin, and compelled of our own knowledge and volition to turn our hearts away from it and toward God. This process is designated in the Scriptures a ‘change of mind’ (heart); in dogmatics, conversion; in the language of the confessions, repentance.

“The old dogmaticians discriminate between the so-called repentance of the lapsed and that of the faithful, referring in the one case to the fundamental decision marking the beginning of a genuine Christian life and in the other to the daily repentance of those who live as obedient subjects of grace. It makes, of course, a great difference whether we have in view only separate assaults of evil and the original determinative act of renouncing the dominion of sin or a continuous, though oft interrupted, dominion of the spirit of God. To such a harmonious whole must every life attain that would be considered truly Christian. Good resolutions will not suffice.” *Glaubens.*, p. 440 f.

CONVERSION AS A WORK AND ACT OF GOD AND ONLY THUS AN
ACT ALSO OF MAN.

A change of mind (heart) is in the Scriptures required of man: “Repent,” “change your mind,” “be converted.” And as the Scriptures demand this of us, we also inwardly realize that the demand is pressed home upon us by the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Word; and, failing to meet the demand, we hear the condemning verdict: “Ye would not.” If the change demanded be a change of the will, we know that our willing cannot be willed (by another), but *we* must will. Willing is an active thing, not a passive, a matter of freedom in the sense of self-determination. But can we furnish such a will? We all know that we cannot. This is the problem of philosophical

ethics: we ought, but we cannot; it is easy to command, but not to obey. Kant may continue, with his "categorical imperative" and his moral law, to say, "Thou shalt"; but neither he nor any of his followers can tell us how to attain the ability to obey. To preach morality is easy; to enable one to attain morality is difficult. Kant held that there must be a revolution of the most profound principles (controlling the life)—but how this is to be attained neither he nor any one else has been able to show. How shall we be able by the power of our will to change our will itself? We cannot so to speak—lift ourselves out of the ditch. If we are to walk, a stronger hand than ours must lay hold of us and place us upon our feet. A new and higher power must lay hold upon our will and transform it, before it can conduct itself properly in its relation to God. And whoever has been converted knows, that he has not done this, but that God has done it to him, that he should thus have the power over himself to turn himself from sin and to God. The rolling ball can be turned from its course only by the application of some force from without. The Scriptures frequently and in various connections speak of such an influence exerted upon man. "Did not our hearts burn within us," exclaimed the disciples on the road to Emmaus. Of those who listened to the preaching on the great day of Pentecost it is said: "They were cut to the heart"; and of Lydia at Philippi, "God opened her heart." In all these cases there is reference to an act of God, which is in the first instance, as an act, that of God and not of man. In the letter to the church at Laodicea it is said indeed: "I stand at the door and knock"; but that was a congregation of those who were already believers. When reference is made to the act of which we are now speaking, it is not said: "I stand and knock," but, "He opened the heart." It is always an act bearing upon the will—but not a compulsion, which God exerts upon us. The will cannot be compelled—its very office is to *will*. But it may be set in activity; it may be agitated—induced to reverse its purpose. It is possible so to work upon (influence) it, that it shall be able to do what it previously and without such influence could not do. There may be thus not

alone new influences thus exerted upon it, but new impartation of new power. This is not a destruction of the freedom of the will, but the making freedom possible. The determinative influence does not take the place of self-determination; but stops at the boundary-line of self-determination. Man is not deprived of the latter, nor released from it, but it is made possible to him. This does not occur through any power of his own, but it is an effectual impartation of ability, resting upon an actual influence of God, by virtue of which man is not only urged, inclined to choice, and in this sense enabled to decide for God—but the originating factor in securing decision for God is always God's and not man's. In this sense our Confession declares that man is purely passive in conversion, and not in the sense that man conducts himself in a purely receptive way, refrains from action and submits quietly to the influence of God; for to thus quietly submit and let God work upon one is in itself a form of activity, and that the very best activity, upon man's part. He not only *endures*, but *experiences*, the influence of divine grace. Our Church has always been deeply concerned to exalt divine grace alone, and exclude all division of the work of conversion between God and man. "To God alone the glory," has been the watchword. Not that she would thereby exclude the moral activity of man himself from the process: for it is beyond all question that the process of conversion has its course, its stages, its advancing steps, etc., in passing through which there is an inevitable conflict between the flesh and the spirit; and it is self-evident that in this conflict the will of man must be actively engaged. This is insisted upon by the Formula of Concord, as well as, *e. g.*, by Chemnitz its author, who was the first and most influential representative of a Lutheran theology, constructed expressly and positively upon the basis of Melancthonian dogmatics. The will is thus brought into activity, however, only after it has experienced the first operations of renewing grace.

A certain change in the usage of the term, Conversion, must not be overlooked. It is employed in modern times in a more

concrete sense than formerly, as referring to the experience of the process as above defined, whereas the earlier writers applied it to the first renewing operation of the Spirit of God. Bearing this observation in mind, we shall easily find the solution of various misunderstandings and accusations against the more recent presentation of the doctrine of the Church by (German) Lutheran theologians, who have been unjustly charged with teaching Synergism, *i. e.*, an unscriptural participation of the human will and ability in the work of conversion." Glaubensl., p. 439 ff.

REPENTANCE AS AN ELEMENT OF CONVERSION.

"The inward process of conversion effected by God begins in the self-condemnation of Repentance, which consists in the change for mind (heart) wrought by the knowledge of sin, sorrow for sin, and serious determination to forsake sin in order to live unto God. * * * Repentance is in the Scriptures represented as the laying of the foundation of the new life within." Komp., p. 259.

USAGE OF THE TERM, REPENTANCE.

"If we regard conversion as two-sided, a turning away from sin and toward God, then we have in Repentance the first, or negative element, while the positive element is designated Faith. But the usage of the term Repentance has suffered a modification since the days of the Reformation. Employed originally in a legal sense and as signifying an atoning work, the word was at first transferred decidedly to the sphere of the inner life and, as an amendment (comparative of "bass": good), understood in the sense of conversion, embracing thus the two elements of amendment or conversion, *i. e.*, penitence and faith. The Augsburg Confession and our older dogmaticians use the word in this sense when they describe conversion as expressing not the active divine factor, but rather the psychological process of internal moral change. In this sense, penitence is regarded as a part of repentance, and the word "repentance" (*Busse*) itself used in the sense of penitence. Luther in his first Thesis called

attention to this in opposition to the prevailing usage in the Romish Church. "Repentance" had come to be regarded as essentially equivalent to ecclesiastical confession and the confessional, which professed to lead men upon the way of salvation, since it imposed as an atonement for sin, works of satisfaction, by the performance of which man might secure justification. To this, Luther opposed his Thesis I.: The entire life should be true repentance, supplanting thus the limitation of the term to the penitential exercises of a few moments observed in obedience to the requirements of the hierarchical institution of the Church. Thus Luther, following the usage of the Scriptures, transferred repentance from the sphere of outward works to that of inward change, of heart. In harmony with this must we conceive the

NATURE OF REPENTANCE.

By repentance we therefore understand not merely a certain feeling or emotion, indicating thus a merely psychical process or a nervous sensation, corresponding to the modern sense of the word "awakening" or "revival" in the methodistic sense; but a moral process, taking place in the depths of the individual life, and therefore fundamental in character—a process, accordingly, whose genuineness does not depend upon the strength of the emotion experienced nor upon separate manifestations of emotion, and hence cannot be measured by the quantity of flowing tears nor by the violence of bodily convulsions, but upon the moral earnestness and unreserved completeness of the self-condemnation, extending not only to certain acts, which occasion sensations peculiarly unpleasant and even painful, but to the entire moral condition and inner character, including therefore original as well as actual sin.

• A psychological analysis of repentance will reveal the following elements: 1. and chiefly, the *knowledge of sin* and its guilt not merely as theoretical and general, but as a practical reality, involving personal conviction and individual responsibility. This knowledge does not allow us to occupy a position of indifferent neutrality, but places us and our sin in a distinct 2.

Relation to God, as the God of holiness and love—to his holiness, which it sets in contrast with our transgressions and thus awakens within us the terrors of conscience, leading us to dread his wrath; and to his love, in view of which it presents our sin as ingratitude, thus awakening pain and grief. * * * This setting forth of sin in its relation to God leads to 3. *Humiliation* before him, in which we consider ourselves as utterly unworthy of his regard seeing and acknowledging no good in ourselves, and crying: "I am no more worthy to be called thy son." This breaks down all our pride and confidence in self, and thus effects an inner severance between us and our sins. Such sense of unworthiness in God's sight seeks expression in 4. *Confession* before him, in which we roundly and utterly condemn ourselves and lay open before God our inmost thoughts and feelings, Jn. 3 : 20 ff., Eph. 5 : 13. That which stirs and oppresses the heart may now naturally find utterance in the oral confession of particular sins, which our Church's Confession has therefore retained, although it has for the most part been abandoned in practice, having degenerated into an eternal formality and thus lost its solemnity. It still remains, however, on psychological grounds, a necessary requirement of true repentance, that we at least seek out those whom we have injured in order to acknowledge our wrong doing and secure pardon at their hands, thus restoring right relations between them and ourselves, as the Lord has himself directed, Matt. 5 : 23 ff. There has thus been perpetuated the very commendable custom among believers of mutually seeking pardon of one another before approaching the Table of the Lord. With the confession of wrong-doing is by a natural necessity, connected a 5. *Purpose of amendment*. This attests the sincerity of the repentance, and furnishes the negative presumption involved in the plea for pardon, as the plea itself implies the existence of faith that the pardon implored will be granted. Thus repentance finds utterance in faith—at least according to the traditional mode of presenting the doctrine and conducting catechetical instruction.

Some modern theologians, indeed (the Ritschlian school), re-

verse the order, placing faith before repentance. It is claimed that Luther at first advocated this order and was only in later years induced to change it under the influence of Melancthon, who, it is said, was driven by his sad experience of the low condition of morality among the common people to fall back upon the early Romish system of legality. This led, it is claimed, to the false doctrine of Pietism in regard to the penitential struggle necessarily preceding faith, and all the extravagances which have been associated with that doctrine. The drastic method thus introduced is now to be supplanted by reliance upon the educational work of the Church, which leads from faith to faith, and thus itself presupposes faith.

But it is overlooked by these teachers, that our old theologians speak of two kinds of repentance—that of the lapsed and that of the faithful, *i. e.*, of the repentance by which the state of grace is first attained in our personal life, and that by which such a state is maintained and continually renewed. The entire revealed plan of salvation involves the order: law and gospel, Moses and Christ, *i. e.*, repentance and faith. Thus also Luther arranged his Smaller Catechism, placing the Decalogue before the three articles setting forth Christian faith; and all utterances of the Reformer not in apparent harmony with this order must be interpreted in the light of this fundamental confession (see the last article of Lipsius' upon Luther's Doctrine of Repentance). It is to be feared that under the new mode of presenting these important doctrines, less emphasis would be laid upon the serious nature of sin and its merited condemnation. Sin as an offence against God must meet a verdict of condemnation in our own hearts and secure forgiveness before we can venture to approach God with even an imploring faith. Before the prodigal son ventured, hoping in his father's love, to arise and seek his father's house, he had under the stern discipline of his trying experiences inwardly freed himself from the sin of disobedience, and the words uttered in humble confession and with the plea for forgiveness were only a revelation of the inner self-condemnation, which lay at the basis of his faith in the forgiveness to be attained. God is not only a God of tender

love always ready to forgive, but also a holy and zealous God, who hates sin and is angry with the sinner. Before we can summon courage to believe in the love of God, we must first have gained a heart-felt conviction of his inflexible holiness. Otherwise we have but a superficial Christianity, which does not regard sin in a serious light, but consoles itself too readily with the thought of the divine benevolence. We have thus already implied the

MEANS BY WHICH REPENTANCE IS PRODUCED.

The ancient doctrine of our church touching law and gospel commonly refers repentance to the law as its producing cause, and faith to the gospel. But should we not "know nothing but Christ only"? What have we to do with Moses? It would so appear from early utterances of Luther in opposition to the Romish system of legality. This view was taken of the matter also by theologians of the so-called Antinomian tendency (Agricola of Eisleben). Moses, it was said, belongs in the hall of justice, not upon the pulpit. The pulpit must know only of Christ, and hence teach even repentance only from the gospel. It is said to have been the error of Melanchthon, to esteem the preaching of the law necessary for the restraint of the rude populace making it therefore an essential part of the church's teaching for the common people; and Luther at length followed him in this, although in adopting such an arrangement of the doctrine he departed from his own earlier teaching. It is indeed true that pedagogic considerations were always for Melanchthon of controlling importance, and we cannot to the present day ignore them in view of the actual conditions existing in the congregational life of the Empirical Church. But it must be remembered that Luther himself never lost sight of these, as is evident from his labors in the exposition of the Decalogue; and his later emphasis upon the law in the application of the order of salvation to the needs of the individual soul was not an aberration from, but entirely in harmony with, his earlier principles. In his discussions, "Against the Antinomians," he merely repeated and emphasized the fundamental positions which he had

maintained from the first, and the decision of this point of controversy in the Formula of Concord (Artt. IV. and V.) moves entirely along the same line. But the preaching of the law for the awakening of repentance is not severed from the preaching of Christ, nor to be at all restricted to the "thunders of Sinai." On the contrary, Christ crucified must ever remain the central-point. Yet the cross of Christ stands in a double relation and the preaching of the cross is two-fold: for as the death upon the cross is the highest revelation of the forgiving love of God, it is at the same time the severest arraignment of sin and its most overwhelming condemnation, and thus—if, as our Confession teaches, the law is everything which convinces us of sin—the most pungent preaching of the law. Nothing else can be vividly set before us our sins, or so thoroughly humiliate us, as the "Sacred Head now wounded." It is indeed true, that our heart and lips should be so full of the doctrine of the cross, that we really know nothing but Christ crucified, and are ever recurring to it; but this doctrine is at once our severest accuser and judge, and, if we suffer ourselves to be judged and humiliated by it, our comforter, lifting us up and assuring us of the grace of God.

Such would be the NORMAL COURSE, the inner process of transformation being carried forward harmoniously in penitent recognition and renunciation of our sinfulness until its aim be accomplished. But we all know how far the life of the believer falls below the ideal of such an unimpeded progress, and how many interruptions are experienced—in weak surrender of purpose, in the lack of complete self-condemnation, in serious relapses. There are perhaps some particular besetting sins which shun the light and are still cherished in secret, and in consequence the conflict becomes less strenuous: the conscience is not entirely free and there rests, as it were, a restraining curse upon the development of the incipient Christian life, making it impossible for it to attain to the full freedom and joyousness of a consciously progressing Christian development. Yet the heart cannot attain peace until it can pronounce a full and complete "No" and "Yes"—No to sin, and yes to Christ, *i. e.*, until conversion has

become a reality in repentance and faith; for beginning in repentance

CONVERSION IS COMPLETED IN FAITH.

As repentance is the beginning of conversion, the penitent turning of the soul away from sin involves, at least in aim, an inward turning toward Christ. And if the entire inward transformation is a work of the Holy Spirit, this is to be affirmed particularly of faith, as the aim of this inward movement. Salvation in the day of judgment, as St. Paul explains in the vivid discourse, Rom. 10: 14 ff., presupposes that one call upon the name of the Lord; this again presupposes the word of gospel proclamation, which awakens faith. Thus faith is a work of the Word of God, and furthermore, as the apostle reminds us, Col. 2: 12 in analogy with the Work of God by which he raised up Christ from the Dead, the working of a new life through the power of God himself. Yet, on the other hand, we ourselves must believe, just as well as we must ourselves repent and be converted (German reflexive—*sich bekehren*), on which account the apostle is fond of describing faith as obedience (*e. g.*, Rom. 1: 5). But obedience must be rendered by every man for himself. Faith is therefore at the same time God's work and man's—the work of God in so far as he through his Word effectually makes possible faith as well as repentance, our work in so far as we, thereupon and in the power of the divine act, conduct ourselves accordingly. It is, further, a personal activity, in which is engaged not merely some one endowment or power of our inward nature, but the whole and the profoundest depths of our nature—what the Scriptures call the “heart,” *i. e.*, our inward personal life, in which knowledge and will are combined. It is therefore also a universal moral activity alike possible to all, in which the Jew does not act as a Jew nor the heathen as such, but man as a personality everywhere the same. The Apostle Paul never wearies of emphasizing this truth. But the form of this activity upon our part corresponds with the activity of God toward us in the Word. For faith, and nothing else, gives appropriate response to the Word; and as it is the heart of God

which opens itself to us in his offer of grace so is it our heart which opens and offers itself to God in faith."—Glaubensl., p. 443 ff.

In the attainment of faith, Conversion has reached its consummation. Thenceforth, the obedient subject of divine grace walks in newness of life, a new creature in Christ Jesus. The happy results of the great change effected are seen in his *justification* before the throne of infinite justice, so abundantly attested by the divine Word and the inner witness of the Spirit, in the conscious *vital union* with God in Christ, and in process of *sanctification*, by which the happy believer grows daily in likeness to his Master and in fitness for the varied service awaiting him in the association of the saints on earth, whose great mission it is to labor for the conversion of the world to Christ.

ARTICLE II.

THE PEW AND PULPIT OF TO-DAY.

By REV. M. L. YOUNG, PH. D.

In the discussion of questions relating to the pulpit and pew, inefficiency, incompetency, lack of adaptability and various other alleged short-comings on the part of the preacher have been emphasized as principal reasons why greater success has not attended the work of the ministry. In searching for the cause of failure many eyes have been turned to the pulpit. Under the scrutiny of critical and hyper-critical occupants of the pew as well as of censors among the clergy, the abuses and faults of preachers, as individuals, or as a class, have been unduly emphasized. Too often has the burden of the blame for not reaching the masses, the non-attendance of young men at church services, decreasing membership and increasing worldliness in congregations, fallen upon the ministry. The growing frequency of ministerial changes, exacting demands upon the preacher and pastor and cutting down of salaries, are attributable, in the opinion of many, to the character of the ministry which, it is declared, has declined in ability and is wanting in adaptability to the needs of the day. The habit of making the

minister a scapegoat for all the wrongs, real or imaginary, in a congregation is sometimes carried to a ludicrous extreme. The style of dress, the gait, the gestures or even the manner of pronouncing words, has brought upon many a faithful minister opposition sufficiently strong to cause his resignation.

Quite enough has been written on the weakness and declension of the pulpit. Its failings may be admitted, but in magnifying them there is danger of losing sight of obstacles to the Church's progress to be found in the pew. It is not amiss to inquire whether the cause of religion may not be sadly hurt and hindered by incompetency, neglect and devilishness in the pew. The time has come for the discussion of causes of declension in the pew, elements of power or weakness in the congregation, the dead-line among church members and kindred themes.

In considering the pew of to-day we notice, first, its ignorance. This may be considered a bold characterization of the ordinary church of our time. It may be said we are living in the great noontide of civilization, that the hour of highest attainment in scientific and literary knowledge has come, that educational advantages and facilities are more general than ever before in the history of the world. It is true that there has been advancement in secular education. We know more than ever of externals. We have been giving attention to husks and shells. We have learned much from the volume of nature, and this is an important part of education, but if it be true that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" and the question of Job, "Whence cometh wisdom and where is the place of understanding?" has as a correct answer that "The fear of the Lord that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding," then men are ignorant until they know and obey God's word. There is lamentable ignorance of the simple truths of Scripture and even of the questions relating to the Scriptures. In the congregation of average intelligence, not a half dozen members know the difference between higher criticism and church polity.

The lack of information concerning the truths of the Bible is more general in the city than the country. The average farmer

and his family probably know more of the Bible than the business man who is absorbed in the work of buying and selling and whose family devote much time to society, yet it is a painful and humiliating fact that the boys and girls in the homes of the Church and in the Sunday schools generally are getting only the merest jumble of Bible knowledge.

The results of investigation recently made by Prof. Coe, of Northwestern University, a leading Methodist institution, are significant. He put a few simple questions about the Bible to nearly a hundred college students who enjoyed such instruction as the average Sunday school and home afford. The questions were as follows: 1. What is the Pentateuch? 2. What is the higher criticism of the Scriptures? 3. Does the book of Jude belong to the New Testament or to the Old? 4. Name one of the Patriarchs of the Old Testament. 5. Name one of the Judges of the Old Testament. 6. Name three of the kings of Israel. 7. Name three prophets. 8. Give one of the Beatitudes. 9. Quote a verse from the letter to the Romans. Only eight persons answered the nine questions; only thirteen answered eight questions correctly. The average student was able to answer only about one-half of the questions. Ignorance existed where knowledge should be expected. The reason why young people are not informed in Scripture truth may be found in parental neglect and indifference in regard to the religious training of their children. The men and women in our pews, failing to give attention to the history and doctrine taught by the Church, do not train up their children in the way they should go.

In our age, characterized by hurry and bustle, the time-honored methods of careful religious instruction of the young, used with blessed results by the fathers, are considered old-fogyish. The non-Christian and secularizing systems of education prevalent in our day have driven away many from the Church's incomparable methods of early training tried and approved in the centuries gone. We need not wonder at the ignorance of highest truth manifest among the young, when in the text books of the schools which they attend we must make diligent search to

find the name of God. Church members have come to regard modern popular education with such high favor that they give preference to purely secular schools and deem it more important that their children should be regular and prompt in attendance at the day school than at the Sunday school or class for religious instruction. There has been a loss in loosening the reins of family government which in times past required the memorizing of Scripture in youth. The knowledge of God's word gained in the home and Church is the influence to which many of our greatest men attribute the shaping of their characters and their usefulness in life, but the methods of instruction which had such beneficent effect in days gone by are no longer popular. The lack of Scripture knowledge in the pew and the neglect of the use of means by which true enlightenment may be received, continue in spite of the entreaties from the pulpit to give attention to family instruction and the offers of ministers to teach the young.

The awaking of some of the leading educators of our country to a sense of the peril involved in the neglect of the moral and religious training of the young, is a hopeful indication. Words of warning are spoken by such scholarly and influential teachers as President Harper of Chicago University, who says: "It is difficult to prophesy what the result of our present method of educating the youth will be in fifty years. We are training the mind in our public schools, but the moral side in the child's nature is almost entirely neglected. The Roman Catholic Church insists on remedying this manifest evil, but our Protestant churches seem to ignore it completely. They expect the Sunday school to make good what our public schools leave undone, and the consequence is that we overlook a danger as real and as great as any we have had to face."

Another thing to be mentioned as we look at the pew is the secular spirit which pervades it. This is the spirit of the times which in its outbreathing has descended with blighting power upon every good institution. The hearts of many go after covetousness. Mammonism is an evil which has tainted many a church member. The excitement, feverish haste and rash ad-

venture of our day find their impulse in the greed for gold. And so from Monday morning till Saturday night there is a rush for material possessions. Our beastly prosperity has made difficult the endeavor to give attention to our spiritual well-being

The late Bishop Coxe severely characterized materialistic tendencies among church people when he said, in referring to persons who were getting gain by extortion in business enterprises: "If men engaged in these affairs six days in every seven, consent to go up to the temple on the seventh, we may be sure they carry their tables with them and set them up in the holy place as really as did those of old, who turned the house of prayer into a den of thieves. What power can 'the pulpit' have with these? Nothing less than 'the whip of small cords' can purge away such dross and squalor. But you say those are the vices of the cities; nay, the town has infected the country. Everywhere the newspaper becomes the Bible of the people and everywhere is this same haste to be rich."

With the vast accumulation of wealth, especially in our country, and the material possessions which have come into the hands of church members, the money power has become dictatorial and seeks supremacy over God's heritage. It is not of rare occurrence to see a rich man or a coterie of rich men running a church, and sometimes pastors are elected and dismissed and the affairs of the Church are controlled by a man or a few men of large means who are not even members, and whose lives are far beneath the standard of ordinary morality. The subserviency of an entire congregation to a godless man who assumes leadership in a church is a pitiable condition.

Akin to the money power which is seeking to control the affairs of the Church is the whiskey king. The rule of rum in politics is despotic. Legislation in municipality and state is shaped at the dictation of this power. The favor of judges and even of the chief executive of the nation is given to this ruinous ruler.

This greatest enemy of the home and of public weal is not satisfied with the ascendancy gained in civic affairs, but presumes to lay strong hands on the Church. Are there not con-

gregations which will have no word of censure spoken to the friend of the saloon in the Church? Are there not congregations which bridle the tongue of the pastor, forbidding him to utter words of denunciation against the rum traffic? The freedom of speech is denied because, forsooth, a rich rumseller sits in the pew. Some who are in high places in the Church apologize for the commander-in-chief of our army because he declines to protect our boys from the curse of the canteen. The saloon is aggressive and seeks to make the Church an ally in its work of destruction.

This is the day when the evils of indulgence in strong drink and of the liquor traffic are more clearly exposed than ever before. This is the day when there is less excuse for these evils than ever before. At such a time complicity of the pew with this great enemy of the Church is sin of deepest dye.

But we pass to another aspect of the modern pew—its irreverence. There is a tendency to regard the church as a place of entertainment; so fine music—the nearer it approaches the operatic the better—is the great attraction in the church service. Something new, pleasing, is looked for. The sermon must be short, racy. Everything must be so shaped that the young will be entertained and amused. Ian Maclaren, in a recent number of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, calls attention to the marked change in the demands of the pew. He says: "The centre of thought has shifted from eternity to time. * * * The ancient fear of God seems to have departed entirely and with it the sense of the unseen which once constituted the spirit of worship," and he closes with these earnest words: "The Church triumphed by her faith, her holiness, her courage, and by these high virtues she must stand in this age also. She is the witness of immortality, the spiritual home of souls, the servant of the poor, the protector of the friendless, and if she sinks into a place of second-rate entertainment, then it were better that her history should close, for without her spiritual visions and austere ideals the Church is not worth preserving."

With the loss of a sense of eternal verities has come the profanation of the Lord's day. It seems to be no longer a matter

of conscience even for officers of the Church to start on a business or pleasure trip on Sunday, while the reading of the Sunday paper has become general in Christian homes. There has been a rapid increase of Sunday travel induced by the low rates of fare which railway companies offer for that day. This secularization of the Christian Sabbath is a growing evil and the best evidence of the spiritual declension which results from it is the ready apology made for such desecration. The argument of expediency, necessity and changed conditions of society is thought by many to be stronger than God's word, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The indifference concerning the abuse, in manifold forms, of time set apart for the special service and worship of God—holy time—and the existence of lax Sunday laws are indices of declension in spiritual life among those who are called to be the supporters of the proper observance of God's day.

There are marks more clearly distinctive of the pew of our day—a pew which differs widely from that of the fathers. Once learning and efficiency, as the fruit of mature age, were highly esteemed in the churches. Now it is more difficult for the average doctor of divinity, though a man of ripe scholarship and wisdom which come with diligent study and experience, and of natural force unabated, than for a young man, fresh from the theological seminary to become settled in a desirable field of labor. Indeed some leading parishes, tacitly or openly, inform the Church that no candidate over the age of forty years will be considered. This setting aside of aged ministers is attributable to the general opinion among church members that young men possess drawing qualities. The captious spirit, now widely prevalent, emphasizes the secular side of the preacher's work and thus we are confronted with the condition which, as one says, demands "that the sermon be made palatable and pleasant, rather than clear, convincing and rebuking—the faithful presentation and application of divine truth to human sin and the highest needs of man. Hence the selection of pastors on these secular and superficial grounds, as a matter of ecclesiastical business only, and in the light of the merely temporal needs

of the Church, such selection often being made by the Christian membership of the Church in the light of the judgment and demands of the outside, worldly community. Thus are the clerical character and office equally lowered in the view of both the Church and the world and the way fully opened for one gradual decadence of spiritual tone."

In our day the proportion of mere pew-holders among the church membership is large. There are persons who are hearers only. They are not concerned in the spiritual condition of the Church—its real life is no care to them. They never pray for the Church, never make any sacrifice for its interests, never devise any plans for carrying to success the true work of the Church.

Among the most discouraging features of church work is the unwillingness of the pew to coöperate in practical personal effort to save souls. Few members will consent to come into such close contact with the unsaved as is needed to give assurance of a vital interest in the spiritual welfare of mankind—Many, it is true, will give of their means to aid any movement for the evangelization of the masses, but beg to be excused from bearing the gospel personally to the unenlightened and erring. To talk to a man about his soul, to bear witness of the love and grace of Jesus, seem to be considered very generally as duties not belonging to the ordinary Christian; but surely following Christ means bearing the light to those who are dying in darkness by our side, toiling to win men from Satan to God—The personal endeavor to bring men to Christ needs be put forth with glowing energy by increased numbers in order to make the pew such a mighty agency for the elevation of humanity as God designed it to be.

A condition alien to the spirit of our Saviour is witnessed in the moving of churches from sections of our cities where the greatest spiritual destitution exists. In some parts of the large cities we do not find the preaching of the gospel to the poor as the sign that the Messiah has come. Provision is rather made for the rich. The sections in which the wealthy and fashionable people live are sometimes crowded with churches while in

large areas containing the abodes of the poor not a single church is found. The unwillingness to make personal efforts in behalf of the poor who are outside the fold of Christ begets a spirit of exclusiveness. In some congregations this spirit is so pronounced that only well-to-do people are cordially welcomed to membership.

When church membership is regarded as little more than a passport to good society, or a means for maintaining respectability, it has drifted far from the unworldly aim and life of the Apostolic Church. The disciples of the first centuries were little affected by the sordid, pleasure-seeking age in which they lived. They were not "of the world." In our times when persecution is scarcely known in Christian lands, the Church is influenced largely by the world.

The pew partakes of the general character of religion and morality existing in the community and country, and the moral status of our land does not differ widely from that of other closely related nationalities, especially the English people for whom we have lately developed the warmest affection. Dean Farrar, in a recent article, gives us a view of present-day England. He says: "It is not possible to be content with the state of things in England. The alarming spread of betting and gambling among workingmen and the youths of great cities—so that this ruinous vice helps to fill our prisons, and (in the north of England especially) has ruined the healthy influence of our games; the eager love of money which leads to much wild speculation and commercial dishonesty; the cruel indifference with which we degrade the helpless childhood of the world by deluging savage tribes with drink, the growth of Hoolyganism, and crimes of brutal violence, the dominance of a selfishness which immerses itself in luxury, pleasure and amusement, while a poverty more and more squalid welters almost at the doors of the wealthy; the growth of a sullen and angry feeling of discontent among thousands of the poorer class; the decay of faith in the deepest and most awfully vital truth, the ever abiding and infinitely loathsome curse of drink, which seems, among women at any rate, to be gaining rather than losing ground,

and as Pope Leo XIII. says, 'drags unnumbered souls to perdition;' the tendency to substitute niggling nullities and fetish worshipping superstitions for 'religion pure and undefiled'—all these things give serious ground for disquietude." Such condition of public morals, the counterpart of which we find in our own country, gives color to the religious life of the pew.

The pulpit has defects and shortcomings but it has not deteriorated as much as the pew. Who will gainsay the opinion of Prof. Hunt who declares: "The evangelistic Christian pulpit of the English world is as able and efficient today as it has ever been and as well adapted as ever to meet the ever new and trying conditions that confront it. In America, especially, there has never been a worthier ministry than there is at this moment—a ministry called upon to face issues and overcome obstacles of which the earlier clergy never dreamed, and before which they would have been, humanly speaking, utterly powerless. Never have we had a brainier and a braver ministry."

The demands made upon the pulpit to-day are such as no other profession is called to meet. The intellectual work required is far more comprehensive and constant than that of any other man of letters. Lawyers, teachers and editors confine their efforts to one line of work in their calling. There are many departments in the professions of law, teaching and journalism, and no man now undertakes to compass the entire field of knowledge in any of these professions, but the minister, besides preaching, is expected to do many other things. He must prepare weekly lectures, instruct the young, make pastoral calls, perform social functions, serve as general director of the church's activities, keep himself informed on the questions of the day. Exactions are made not only upon the minister himself, but upon his family as well. The time and energy necessary for the performance of his manifold duties do not have proper consideration. The labor involved in the preparation of sermons is not appreciated. The writer heard an influential layman, in a public address, estimate the time required for the preparation of a sermon at two hours

and a half. Two days and a half is a more correct estimate of the time needed for preparing a sermon worthy of the name.

An unreasonable demand made upon the ministry is to preach sermons interesting and popular for persons who have little sympathy with the truth, will not receive the word in meekness, nor become true "helpers in Christ Jesus." One truly says: When to the mental and spiritual exactions of the ministry there is joined an irresponsible and inactive constituency enough is added to break the back and break the heart of any man. In the light of this fact the perpetuity of the Christian Church is one of the miracles of modern Christendom.

Notwithstanding encroachments and demands upon the pulpit, inconsiderate or unreasonable, and the impatience with which some hear the old doctrines of sin and salvation, the preaching of to-day is, in general, an unquestioned and clear-toned bearing of God's message to men. The pulpit dare not be weak in its convictions of the holiness of God nor the sinfulness of man, nor give less emphasis than in the past to the preaching of God's word as the means of conversion from sin to holiness.

Greater stress must be put upon the place which preaching occupies as an instrumentality in God's hands for the evangelization of the world. The press and the platform must appear as insignificant moral agencies as compared with the pulpit. The pulpit is the high place from which God's messages are delivered to lost mankind, infinitely higher than the position of teacher, barrister, sage or statesman. The man in the pulpit is God's "messenger"; he comes to men clothed with authority. Conscious of his mission he bears the truth to the hearts of those who will hear, with such convincing power as always accompanies the utterance of personal belief. To-day when human knowledge and wisdom are exalted the pulpit must not lose sight of that which constitutes its foundation, its strength, its permanence, its glory. Divine revelation is the basis, the pillar, the capstone of the pulpit. God's truth, vitalized, issuing from a living experience has the strange power of moving and drawing men.

In our day the essential elements in preaching, truth and personality, are not to be undervalued. A ministry characterized by deep piety, physical and intellectual energy, moral courage, strong common sense, and unwearied consecration, needed in every age, is the special need of our day.

The theme of the ages is Christ. The preaching of morality without Christ as motive and example will not satisfy the longing of sincere souls in any age. To preach Christ is the only effective way of preaching morality in all its bearings on human weal. Christ is the proper theme for this age. Christ the Son of God, the Lamb of God, the divine sacrifice for sin and the victor over sin for every one who believes, is to be proclaimed in this age with all the power of consecrated intellect and heart. The atonement is the theme best adapted to present-day needs.

Of all the addresses delivered at the late Congregational Council, the one which aroused the highest enthusiasm was that of Dr. Forsyth on the gospel of the atonement. The presentation of so-called live subjects and the up-to-date sneers at the old doctrines of sin did not stir rationalistic Boston so profoundly as did the telling of the old story of the incarnation and the atonement. That address, which was out of harmony with much that had been said before, formed the climax of the convention. To it was given "Amen" and applause such as no other address called forth, and it roused the audience from their seats to sing, "In the Cross of Christ I Glory." It furnished striking evidence of the fact that what the heart longs for is the old gospel, and the old gospel is the gospel for the times.

Truth is truth forever and it is to be presented as it is in Christ, who is eternally the same. Sin is essentially the same in every age, and its consequences are the same, but it changes its forms and becomes necessary to apply the truth to changed moral conditions. So it is the duty of the pulpit to study the attitude of Christ towards present day problems, and declare the will of Christ to this generation in such manner as will meet the peculiar needs of the age.

The pulpit of to-day must not ignore the demands justly made upon it for support in proper movements for the relief of

the suffering and oppressed. It must not speak in a half-hearted, apologetic sort of a way of Sunday rest, of child labor and women labor. The active support of the clergy must be enlisted in the work of investigating and lessening the evils of such abominations as the sweating system and the saloon. Wise and proper movements in the interest of social and political reform deserve from us something more than listless well-wishing.

The words of Joseph Parker recently uttered have the right ring: "I am wearied with your milk and water man. I want the preacher whether he be popular or unpopular to be fearless, independent, gracious, inflexible in justice. You may stone him, but God will nourish his soul."

The courageous presentation of the truth fails not to give timely warning against such insidious beginnings of criminality and disgrace as gambling and drinking in the home, seemingly so harmless when spoken of as "progressive euchre" and the "social glass." Sometimes it becomes necessary in seeking to save the people from vice to warn the young against the practice of secret self-debasing habits and to speak plainly of the dreadful sin of murdering unborn infants—a sin, according to the testimony of physicians, alarmingly prevalent in the married state.

The pulpit moving up to the front and leading the forces in the onward march against evils which endanger the purity and perpetuity of the family and the state, assures truest and highest success in the work of the Church. To halt when others advance, to be timid and dilatory and vacillating or to be subservient to money power or political expediences makes the pulpit a poor teacher in wise and just social reforms.

The fearlessness of an Ezra, a Daniel, a Luther, a Whitefield is contagious and such heroic courage in the preacher serves to make men in the pew resolute, iron-hearted in support and defense of the right.

The fearlessness, the courage and the patience of the ministry of to-day give promise of improvement in the pew. The work of God's ambassadors will be fruitful. We may not be disheartened by the evils of the present. The forces are in line for their extermination. If the darkness seem blacker than ever, it

may be because the revealing light is beginning to shine more gloriously.

The voice of history gives us cheer. The backward glance brings courage. The Church must hear the words, "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee."

What faith has done faith can do again. Fiercer battles have been fought in the past than we are fighting to-day. Stronger forces were met. In Reformation times a powerful and corrupt hierarchy was the foe. The very institution which God had ordained for the enlightening and saving of men became the means whereby they were kept in darkness. A few men of faith faced this form of evil and gained the victory. If they were victors in a great conflict, compared with which our contests are mere skirmishes, we have no reason to despond.

ARTICLE III.

"THE POWER OF HIS RESURRECTION."

BY PROF. W. H. WYNN, PH. D., D. D.

It is related of our Lord, that his last words on earth were an assumption of universal authority or power, that is, dominion over all the physical and moral forces that anywhere are, or were ordained to be—all power in heaven and on earth. These are the last words, and the first words—the last words of the incarnate ministry; the first words of the glorified One, going forth to a universal spiritual ministry among the worlds, which he had made. We catch in this way their infinite scope. How incommensurably vast the realm over which he reigns, taking in the whole dual order of things, the physical universe lying below, and the infinitely larger spiritual universe incumbent from above—the sky, into which at that moment he seemed to withdraw, the myriad worlds that roll on forever there; and that vaster realm of souls, which the wildest ranges of our material immensities cannot reach—the evanishing figure, there on the Galilean mount, is over it all.

The assumption is the more wonderful, because of the point

of time in which it was made. The crucifixion and the sepulchre have come in between. A little while ago he was in the hands of the mob. They had arrested him, and had him bound. They made him bow to the lash; they nailed him, hands and feet, to the cruel cross, and scoffing men came and looked upon his silent body, and said he was dead. They put that body in the heart of the hills and sealed it, a rumor having been whispered abroad, that the dead man had talked freely of his power over death, and had declared, if killed, he would come to life again. The strongest testimony goes to prove, that he made good his promise. In the history of evidence there is nothing so conclusive. The multitude before that open sepulchre, the whole city crowding on that memorable morning into the garden of Joseph, gaping, curious, defeated, asking how the seals could have been disturbed; what the guards could have been doing; who could have rolled that massive stone away—over all these, and over the powers of darkness, the empty sepulchre shouts defiance, to which comes in the testimony of hundreds of eye-witnesses, who afterwards saw him alive. Great jurists, who are accustomed to weighing evidence, concede that no historical event, near or remote, has been so incontestably sustained as the fact that Jesus rose from the dead.

And yet, somehow, while dwelling most profoundly on this subject, we are driven to feel that the strongest proof of this stupendous event does not lie in the testimony of eye-witnesses. Out of our devotional habits, it may be, or the necessities of our spiritual experience—for some reason, we are compelled to think that court processes, the laws of evidence, juridical standards, applied to the life, history, and religion of Jesus, are somehow harsh and incompatible, out of character with the vastness of the event—somewhat as when Pilate undertook to look at Jesus in the light of Roman law. The silent man there, with cords around his wrists, travel-stained and weary from long, sleepless, night-watches under the temple guards, has something in him, perceptible in his bearing, or else falling in a strange light from his countenance, that outshines all the majesty of the Roman

law, and that Pilate recognizes as beyond the reach of all the legal standards he knew. Do you want evidence, such as the courts require to substantiate any matter of fact, putting men on the witness-stand, and, without collusion and without bias, getting their testimony as to what they say and heard?—you can have an abundance of this, going to show that Jesus was seen many times after his resurrection from the grave.

But for a fact of this kind we instinctively press for stronger evidence than human jurisprudence can take note of, a higher species of attestation than is known in human courts. If there is difficulty in stating what this is, it is because the religious consciousness has a logic of its own, asserting itself in emotional prompting, even where its canons are not accepted as authoritative law. That it was, that wrought so powerfully on Pilate, and on Pilate's wife. A kind of testimony slipped into the ears of the Procurator, that did not want to be articulated in words, but which silently and swiftly rebutted all the loud-mouthed scandal the riotous court of the Jews were shouting out against him. Nearer to the law than the mob, no doubt, a Roman official would be likely to have a sense of responsibility which the mob had not. But, evidently, the Nazarene was a kind of prisoner that Pilate had never before seen. Fettered he was, disheveled from abuse, his visage marred, and manifestly in the hands of the temple police, there was yet something about him that Pilate had never before witnessed in mortal man, a majesty, a subdued grandeur of personality, that threw the great diplomat off his guard, and which legend says haunted him to the bitter end. Pilate's wife also saw this same thing in her dreams—dreams, where shadows, often, are more authoritative than bristling lictors around a curule chair.

Now what was that? Our answer must involve some of the subtlest experiences of human life. We know of two ways of judging men, the neighbors with whom we associate, the men and women who walk with us, and mingle with us, along the paths of social and business life—two ways: superficially, when we confine our estimate to matters of fact; profoundly, when we have them as our friends.

On the witness stand, giving in testimony as to a man's character, we should be confined to matters of fact. Opinion, rumor, the testimony of feeling as to what a man is, would be ruled out of court. Feeling might be prejudice; opinion the mere whim of a friendly bias. But when we have taken a man into our heart of hearts, into our sympathy, our love, we know him by a kind of self-manifestation, that goes far beyond the measurement of mere out-door facts. Men wear masks when out-of-doors—the real self never coming fully into view in the whirl of many motives, and many conflicting interests, sweeping through the streets. In business, all day long, or casually meeting one another with a passing salute, it is always with the visor down, and shielding our privileged privacy under a swift disguise. The real man appears only in his home, sitting by the fire-side with wife and children, and under the glowing altars of the household gods. If you want to know who your closest business companion really is, you must contrive, somehow, to observe him unobserved in the retiracy of his home. The moment he meets you at the door, both for him and for you, the instinctive habit of masquerading is resumed, and the outside self is put on. If, however, he will make you a member of his household, he and you together will throw off your outside disguises, and your deepest personality will have full play.

Poor, indeed, would be our knowledge of Christ, and fallacious, also, if we had to approach him simply through the avenue of outside fact—let that fact be stupendous and marvelous in the highest degree. Here is one who consents to have himself swept by violence into the realms of the dead. What for? Evidently to demonstrate that he has all the subtle forces of life under his control; who houses with corruption, for a brief space, that he may bring back from it, as developed out of it, a new organism, in which infinite measures of spiritual worth and potency may reside—his feet just leaving the heights of Galilee, apparently for a tour of the universe, and in his farewell words fixing his rank as the equal of God, claiming all power, all authority, absolute deific incumbency over all things—to one wanting evidence of all this, demanding an ar-

ray of argument that shall compel his belief, what shall we say?

Well, what are the implications, in the first place—what pre-supposed condition in the one asserting such a rank, would be necessary to make our acquiescence easy, and lead us on to say: "Yes, this thing being so, that other comes after as a matter of course"? Here is one, who having been clearly dead, is discovered alive—has conquered death. Then, of necessity, he must have power over life and death. But there are deeper involutions of our thought. The dead man is not only alive, but pervasively alive, that is to say, immanent, in all things living and dead—not on the heights of Galilee only, nor in the depths of immensity into which he plunged, but everywhere, in the air that we are this moment breathing, in all the physical, and mental, and spiritual forces that are at work here, and in all places of his dominion—the historically outside figure in Galilee, being the spiritually inside, all-pervasive, energy of the world. The fact of the resurrection, if it be granted, takes all this vast matter into its logical embrace. But are we satisfied? Has the power of the resurrection, thereby, opened its full glory upon our mind?

We speak all too familiarly of the power of the resurrection, and are fond of adverting to the fact, that those favored men who witnessed it, went forth into the world with almost that solitary theme on their lips. Glad news with those primitive preachers was quite comprehensively the "resurrection" and thereby the "life." They went saying: We saw him crucified. Some of our company were present at his embalming. The highest authorities of the state made sure of his death, and were at pains to have him securely imprisoned in a tomb—after all which we saw him alive, and talked with him, and walked with him, and held sweet converse with him, at divers times, for the space of forty days. Enthusiasm over a fact of that kind for an eye-witness, might very well transcend all bounds, for what tremendous problems are once and forever solved by it, unquestionably for him who witnessed it, and ultimately for all those who receive without bias the story he tells.

But you and I, coming on the stage nearly two thousand years after the event, cannot have our enthusiasm kindled to an equal pitch. We may, indeed, accept most cordially, and even gladly, the testimony of Peter and John, and the rest, as to the fact of the resurrection, and by letting our historic imagination play warmly over the event, come into some sort of outdoor realization of the "power of resurrection." Reading about it, with all the stores of richest scholarship in the investigation; weighing evidence after the most rigid methods of the procedure of the courts—all this will but bring the towering figure to our doorstep, or, at best, into a knocking attitude before the door.

Just here we face the element of *domesticity*, or devout *privacy*, in the religion of Jesus, a mystical element, of which the learned critics can take no note. Before it, all outside methods and formulæ are impotent and inept. Only the analogy of a very familiar experience, will throw light on that act of the soul—fundamental and essential to discipleship, always—in which it apprehends, spiritually, the full deific implications of the resurrection event—an event we cannot be satisfied to look at only adown the ever-fading and ever-chilling perspective of history. Human personality, we know, will never throw open its doors to another except in the privacy of home, round the hearth-stone, where men live together, and let their inmost purposes and experiences have free course. If this is true of finite personality, of the men and women whom we really know on earth, how much more so must it be of that infinite personality, which drew itself from the sepulchre, with all the attributes of the godhead clinging to its robes. Out there, on the arena of history, this personality drawing itself from the sepulchre, and then on a high mountain, in spectacular splendor, visibly expanding itself to take in immensity and infinity, and from having been imprisoned in time and space, come to be the recognized source of all that, with all the worlds nestling in his embrace—a fact, or an assumption like this, on the bare floor of history, may very well be compassed about by dissentient inquiries and insinuations of doubt. What was it all for—this

going down into the grave and coming up again—this transformation of a martyred preacher into a glorified God? Did he not leave our earth, where for a few hallowed years his path was strewn with wonders, and where, evidently, he had it in his power to stay, and, staying, would have blessed us forever? Did he not ascend up on high, and sit down at the right hand of God the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead? Does not the creed itself confine the whole vast panorama of the resurrection to the superficies of an historical canvass, ignoring, in this way, the one fundamental, the element of privacy, upon which our foregone conclusions have been so sanguinely based? There it is. He ascended into heaven—going up literally upon a pavilion of cloud—away from our earth, in actual extradition to a localized habitation in the deepest recesses of the home of God—staying there, until the rolling cycles shall call him forth again, to dispense judgment in a final assize.

Now I protest, this Risen Jesus shall not leave the mankind into whose bosom he descended. It must not be so. I cannot make the far journey through the dim and untraversable immensities to find him, in his solitary seat fast by the right hand of God—after his having been so near to us, and once on the very threshold of our homes. This matter has been too literally conceived, and in face of it, we must be reminded, over and over again, of the Apostolic canon of interpretation, "the letter killeth, it is the Spirit that giveth life." Going up from the heights of Galilee, fading off in the illimitable sky, finally regaining his great white throne left vacant through the brief years of his incarnate humiliation—thence to send out a delegated agency on Pentecostal visitations to bereaved assemblies, praying and forlorn—there must be some misconception in this matter, since "up" and "down" are illusory terms with reference to the eternal world. Possibly we have fallen into the error—a very common one, indeed,—of making a metaphor stand for a literal fact. The eternal world best speaks to our dull conceptions, by the inarticulate language of symbol, letting in light, as we are able to receive it, from behind the shifting obscurations

of figures of speech. And so it is well to suspect some such accommodation, when the risen Jesus is made to ascend from our planet to the "right hand of God," that being only a metaphorical ascription of omnipresent power to him who, a little while ago, seemed to be weaker than any child, and had been laid away as a dead man in a tomb—rather than a literal description of a localized abode for the glorified Son of Man, far, far away, from the little group he has left as orphans in the world. Luther's intuition was never profounder, than in his famous saying: "The right hand of God is everywhere."

Putting all this together, we are driven to the conclusion, that Jesus went up into his resurrection habit, not that he might be absent, but that he might be present, supplementing his historical visitation to the streets of our cities, with his resurrection indwelling in the very homes of our souls. Long time ago, and now in the historical aspects of his coming, my beloved was knocking at the door, possibly with long pleading, and against the luxurious ease that had wrapt me around, as I had composed myself to pleasant dreams—'knocking, until his head was filled with dew, and his locks with the drops of the night, even putting in his hand by the latch of the door, and making the handles thereof to distill with the odor of myrrh, of sweet-smelling myrrh through all the room—but, at my leisurely opening for him, he was gone. Happy were I, if in this dilemma, I shall go crying after him through the streets of the city, and having found him, I should hold him, and not let him go, until I had brought him into my mother's house.' This sweet spiritual love-idyl, we notice, has its culmination of joy only when the rejected beloved is brought back in triumph to the mother's house. We know the Risen One only when he lives with us, and yields the potency of his resurrection in familiar converse and counsel round the hearth-stone of the soul.

Happily he gave to his disciples, and to us, the key to his resurrection, before he descended into the shadows whence his glorified figure was to emerge. He was going away that he might come again, in such shape as that the narrow environment of his fleshy limitation might be outstript—going so far

as to say, that, whereas now he was simply *with* them, in outside, more or less distant association, then he should be *in* them, a companion God for them in all their ways. Disappearing from the outward eye, he would flash in upon the inward eye, wherever the vision of the soul was searching enough to find him out. The Paraclete, beyond all question, was his way of naming his higher self, with glorified endowment, ubiquity clinging to his wingless robes. Manifestly he made that promise good—demonstrating it, in a brief consummating resurrection history, which is really the world's priceless evangel of peace. Appearing to Mary first, in the quiet glow of that first Easter morning, we notice that he refuses to be touched, because, doubtless, the gross contact would be disappointed in meeting no resistance in the intangible form—which form easily rises and floats over the garden, and is here and there, in mountain, sea, and city, at his option. and passes unobstructed through closely-barred doors. His tutelage is cautious and patronizing, for was he not stooping to men of very simple minds? They might think him a ghost, and through superstitious terror failed to identify their risen Lord. He has gradually prepared them for this preëminent crisis, by temporary outflashings, so to speak, of this same glorified self upon their dazzled sense, in the Transfiguration, for example, or when he walked at night on the troubled sea. At such strange sight they were paralyzed with fear. Fear repels, and yet this august dazzling one must, somehow, become the familiar home confidant of the soul. Oh, how the dull faith of these people was sorely tried on the matter of God—now he was too much man, then he was too much spirit, to satisfy their groping inquiries after the infinite God—reminding us of the petty troubling we are wont to be at, respecting this same great matter, asking if, after all, this story of the Risen One might not be a highly embellished, intensely colored, reproduction of the inveterate ghost-myth, that haunts the religious musings of all the world.

Against all this, we must emphasize the divine ingenuity of the narrative, which at once puts the question of myth, utterly and forever, outside the pale of gospel mystery—since it would

present the impossible predicament of myth refining on itself. This man with miracle in his fingers, suffers himself to be killed by riotous masses, whom he could have paralyzed in the attitude of inflicting the blow. There can be no God in him. Again, the grave is empty, it is true, and the floating figure seems to have made itself apparent on the highway, and along the seashore, and to have come in even here to our closeted assembly, through these tightly-barred doors. He is a ghost and not a god. But observe here the ingenious rebuke of both delusions in the one pathetically condescending test. That I am not a ghost, you may demonstrate by putting your fingers into the prints in my palms, and thrusting your hands into the spear gash in my side. That I am the same man whom you saw laid away in the tomb, and not another, you can palpably attest for yourselves in the same way—nay, rather than that the identification should in the least particular fail, I will share with you the broiled fish you have with you for lunch. Superstition and scepticism, running both ways, the Risen One promptly meets, and never in the history of legend or myth was there so facile an adaptation of means to an end. It is as if he had said, I have come all along this path of incarnate wonder, to be present at the issues of this very hour—suffering that I might enter into my glory—and now this glory, living in the deific proportions of my risen body, I must set securely in the eyes of men, so that a conviction of it may never die out of the world—so that it will be no unreasonable solace, when I promise my disciples to be more intimately with them henceforward, than I was, when toiling and suffering with them in the flesh. “Lo, I am with you always”—that shall be the key to my resurrection glory, for these mourning comrades of mine, and for all those who, through them, shall believe on my name—down “even to the consummation of the age,” or to that unhappy era, if it must come, when men will challenge my theanthropic ministry. and prate learnedly of a metaphysical God.

We come, then, to our Lord's own distinctive doctrine, of his personal indwelling with those who have caught sight of his glorified figure, in the resurrection, and have taken his vitaliz-

ing words into transforming efficacy upon their hearts and lives. To all such the Risen One is their God—the plenary satisfaction of every Godward aspiration that may spring up in their hearts. “He that hath my commandments and keepeth them * * * I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him”—in short, be his God. It behoves us, however, to consider well the scope of this doctrine, lest our interest in it be only half-hearted, taking it as the soldiers cast lots on the seamless garments of the crucified one, there underneath the awful tragedy of the cross. This doctrine must be all to us, or nothing. We must set it down as the essence of the gospel, as we get the meaning of the drama at that point of its evolution, where all the threads of conflicting interest run together and converge. The resurrection sums up everything else in the person and work of our Lord. The world had come to that stage in its history, when it must have the interposition of a divine-human God. The glorified Jesus was that God. He fills the whole disk of the eye of faith. He looms alone on the horizon of the religious consciousness, as in John’s vision of an angel standing in the sun—the sun of righteousness rising with healing in his wings—and to that kind of sun-worship all the world is henceforth invited to come. He is the condensed ritual, also, for all spiritual worship that actually and directly lifts the yearning soul up to its God; for, when cleansing the Temple at Jerusalem of its mercenary desecration, did he not give it as his authority, that the temple of his body was greater than it, and that when the apostate temple had done its worst on the incarnate temple, tearing it down with vandal hands, he would build it up again in three days?

To be brief about it, you cannot call the Risen One God, except in tacit admission of his absolute right. God! O, the immeasurable sweep and vastness of the word! Applying it to Jesus, even when he has emerged from the sepulchre, and has manifestly sloughed off the larger burden of his incarnate limitations in the flesh, may involve an harrassing paralogism against which the logical intellect of man may beat and bleed in vain. The infinite God has no limits—shrinks even from the

deftest touch of any logical predicate, and the theologians and philosophers, therefore, have agreed to consign the whole conception over to the vague and formless inane of spirit—to rest it there—not dreaming, that it is really the realm of agnosticism to which they have arrived. The shining One, on the heights of Olivet, has manifestly come into large measures of spiritual enfranchisement—mounting with the cherubim, and having “under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for clearness”—but to be absolute, the glorified body must transcend all limits, its contour, if we may so speak, must dissolve away into the shadowless mist of the infinite itself. If this be the logical dilemma in conceiving of God, then, of course, we greatly erred in ascribing diefic proportions to the risen body of the crucified Nazarene. Moreover it is essential to our idea of God, that he be immanent in all things,—not measurably pervasive—not at all ever going from place to place—transfusing rather the utmost bounds of immensity, and holding his undiminished fullness inside and outside the universe of worlds. But this Risen figure goes from place to place, soaring or flashing, let us say, and at last seeming to rise in the heavens, as if on an aerial voyage to some celestial port—but all the while held fast, it would seem, by the inveterate clinging of time and space. When I call God immanent, I experience no incongruity, or violence done to my thought, for is not God a spirit, and does not that word suggest an expanse of being lying formless and fadeless on the whole sum of things, compassing creation round, as the sky embosoms the revolving worlds? I call God immanent—is Jesus immanent? He must, indeed, be so, if he is God. Happily there is no greater violence done to the thought, in conceiving the risen body of Jesus so expanding beyond all space limits, as to be endowed with ubiquity, than there is in suffering the idea to drop off into the abyss of a substanceless inane. The alternative seems to be between a living God, and the metaphysical divinity of clouds and darkness on an infinite sea.

I am admonished, that in thus emphasizing the resurrection, I am but reviving a species of anthropomorphism, with which

Christian apologetics has successfully struggled long ago. In the Clementine homilies, in Tertullian, in the more elevated and refined thinking of Lactantius, this problem was essayed, the necessity of conceiving God only as he is revealed in the person of Christ. There was some grossness no doubt, some subtle blight of materialism, in their way of setting forth their ideas of what is clearly the unique quality in the religion of Jesus—that the glorified figure of the Risen One must fill up for us the whole measure of our finite capacity for God. It is not surprising, that the Alexandrian theologians should not have taken to these views. Among them Greek philosophy prevailed, running inevitably into the besetting fallacy of all philosophy, that God can be only negatively known—known as to what he is not, and not as to what he is—that is to say, not known at all. The simple-minded in those days, to whom no great philosophy came with its pageantry of cloud, were wiser than they. Out from Alexandria, in the year 399, in the Scetic desert, there was a band of monks, who were charged with holding anthropomorphic, and, therefore, unspiritual ideas of God, in the way they put the image of Jesus in the niche, where the Bishop of Alexandria said God ought to be. They had no Greek philosophy in their unstudious ranks, but the venerable and saintly Serapion was their prophet and their priest. He was deeply read in the story of Jesus, and the power of the resurrection had passed into his soul. The learned Bishop, Theophilus, thought he must make all haste, to recover those deluded people from the deadly heresy into which they had fallen—not knowing that it was a simple case of “out of the mouth of babes hath he ordained praise.” Groups of scholars were commissioned to labor with Serapion in his desert retreat. He was shown that he was an *anthropomorphite*, underneath which large and sonorous accusation there was slumbering a swift ecclesiastical curse. By persuasion and intimidation, they brought the old man to think he was convinced. In the joy of their success, they would all kneel down together, and thank God for the enlightenment he had poured into these simple

minds. Almost we can hear the dry whining of those sacerdotal and Christless prayers. Meantime, while these prayers were going on—the spirit of Serapion was being tossed and buffeted on a tempestuous sea. He had tried to pray, in the new style, after the manner of the Alexandrian wise ones, who were entrusted with the secrets of God. The eye of his faith had roamed immensity, and had found no object on which it could fix. When it was all over, on rising to his feet, the old man cried out—just as we should have cried out—“Poor wretch that I am! They have taken away my God; on whom shall I now depend; to whom shall I pray?” Brave Serapion! he had recanted under duress, and in the moment of his peril, the power of the resurrection had come to his release. The truth is, as Goethe was wont to reiterate, “Man never knows how anthropomorphic he is.” That heavy cacophonous title describes an inalienable limitation of the human mind—the same that made mythology inevitable in the cruder stages of the religious history of the race—the same that, from the foundation of the world, prepared the Incarnation, as the consummate cultus of generations educated to approach the one God in spirit and in truth.

Finally, it is a curious and instructive fact that this essential Christian mysticism, for reasons, doubtless, deeply imbedded in the religious history of mankind, had to hang on the outermost rim of the consciousness of Christendom, and never get boldly asserted in the formulas of the creeds. The priceless jewel has been carried down the ages in an unseemly casket, possibly that it might escape the swinish desecration of quarreling sectaries, levying tribute, even, on the Ark of the Lord, and pouring libations from consecrated vessels to gods of gold. It must, therefore, be kept in the inviolable privacy of that Holy of Holies of every devout soul of man, where the Risen One will come to dwell, if, indeed, he can find the sweet heavens within us rolling back their doors, and shouting him in with hymns of praise. All down the ages, the shrinking mystics have conserved this gospel of the resurrection, while the scholastics were harrying the outside world with their pedantic clamor, and grind-

ing up their puerile dogmas into logical dust. From Francis to Luther the stream flowed on, often through long stretches of fanatical dreamland, it it true, and many leagues of theosophical mist. It was a stream of esoteric, unformulated, subconscious sentiment, for the most part, concealed under the gloom of monkish austerities, or rushing to the surface over the sterile wastes of sacramental strife. But always the cry was, the sigh was, for the *mystica unio*—how shall the whole space of my inner experience be cleared, and given over to the coming of the glorified Son of Man, as the rightful God entering into possession of his own?

In tracing this current, therefore, we must enter the history of dogma through a postern door. Who was Eckhart, for example, and the *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, who took up with his method of replacing the usurping individuality of man, with the eternal Word of God, born in the soul? Much subtlety there was, and much needless Neo-Platonic soaring into the thin air of transcendental heights—forestalling Hegel in those terrifying ghostly abstractions of "Nicht" and "Ich"—yet fixing on the fundamental requirement of the complete renunciation of self, to give room for the advent of the Divine-Human God. "When I am in this state"—the absolute quietism which his way of thinking recommended—"God brings forth his Son in me." A mistake it was, for the Master himself had plainly conditioned his indwelling on having his commandments and keeping them, therefore on an active ethical rather than a quiescent, renunciation of self. Then came the *Friends of God*, keeping up, even more ardently, the resolute purpose to attain to a living intercourse with the glorified Son of Man, by the renunciation of self—imitating the Master in this exercise, if peradventure the precise nature of that exercise could be ascertained. But here they ran out into two schools. Self must be renounced to give room for God in Christ, but Christ himself, in the days of his humiliation, taught us how to renounce. Tauler, of the *Friends of God*, almost with prophetic inspiration, set his pupils Suso and Ruysbreck on the way of finding out and copying the renunciation of our Lord—the one discover-

ing it, as he thought, in our Lord's passion; therefore, it would be by suffering that the usurping self would be got out of the way—the other, Ruysbrœck, finding it in the Incarnation, thought that the incarnate life of our Lord might be installed in the soul by contemplation, or devout quietism, the self giving way by mental abnegation to the absorbing advent of the Incarnate life. Ruysbrœck taught Groot, and Groot taught Thomas á Kempis, and Thomas threw together the devout Residuum of all schools in that marvelous book, the *Imitation of Christ*, “which has been translated into more languages than any other book save the Bible, and which has moved the hearts of so many men of all nations, characters, and conditions of life.”

If, however, we would see to what extent this tacit, shrinking mysticism, the unformulated power of the resurrection, contributed to the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Religious Reformation of the 16th century—a mysticism essentially ascetic, and not even constructive in its habit—we must be familiar with the earlier stages of Luther's development, a subject we cannot enter upon here. Suffice it to say, that the *Friends of God* brought into the monk's cell two determining influences, which gave type to Luther's theology, in so far as the rush of his reformatory zeal would admit of propositional restraint. Through Staupitz, Tauler's sermons were put in his hands, still regarded as among the noblest the German language has produced. How deeply read he was in these, his life-long preaching and writing abundantly attest. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that the very tissue of his experience was fashioned thereby, and in a sense not over-concessionary it may be said, that as to the deeper spiritual incitements of Luther's tremendous undertaking, this man Tauler stood nearer to him than all the contemporary University Doctors with whom he was wont to consult. The Fathers he repudiated, scholasticism and Aristotelianism were a horror to him, and in the gush of his ardor he more than once set theology itself aside, but never did he forget his indebtedness to Tauler, and certainly never dropt from his thinking the fundamental conceptions of the *Friends of God*. Again, some anonymous member of that body pro-

duced that remarkable book, the *Deutsche Theologie*, called with great propriety "the handbook of mystical devotion" through all these years. Luther pored over the pages of that book. He drank deep into its spirit. He published an edition of it, with a commendatory preface, saying that next to the Bible and St. Augustine, this book appealed to the deepest religious yearnings of his soul. It stood on the same pedestal with the great Tauler—"the subject matter of this little book is in the style of the enlightened Doctor Tauler"—in his preface—and then to Spalatin; "I send you herewith, as it were, an epitome of all the writings of Tauler." In Tauler, he avowed, he found more genuine and sound theology than in all the scholastic theologians and universities of the world. Had not Luther's Ninety-Five Theses, nailed to the door of the Wittenberg church, preceded his edition of the "German Theology" of 1518, we might memorialize the publishing of that "little book," as the first bugle note of the Reformation, sounded down the ages, and echoing distinctly to this day. For out of it came Luther's high view of the Person of Christ, from which he never receded, notwithstanding he unwarily let it down into the wild whirlpool of sacramental disputation, and saw it submerged, for a time at least, in the voluminous sweep of Puritanic agitation all over the world. Through it all, Luther held on to the *mystica unio*, impressing it upon Protestantism at large, even where the creeds have refused it articulate recognition, and upon all theologians in lineal descent from him, as a Christo-centric legacy which they may very well boast of as beyond all calculable price. These words of Luther—let them stand for the right hand of his religious thinking, his Augustinianism being his left; "Christ, I say, not as some in blind language declare, giving us righteousness and himself remaining without; for righteousness is dead—rather, it is never given at all—unless Christ himself is also present, just as there can be no rays of the sun, nor warmth of fire, where there is neither sun nor fire." There it all is, the Risen One, the glorified Son of Man immanent in the Soul.

One word of appealing exhortation to all Christian people

may not be out of place, as bearing upon the peculiar difficulties the religion of the resurrection is compelled to face in the age in which we live. Now, as the issue is plainly made up, a life and death struggle between agnosticism and the Incarnation, might not all the forces of Christendom drop their differences, smother their hates, pull down all partition walls, erase old-time jealousies, extinguish alien fires on their altars, and rally to this one point—especially as when thus mobilized, they will find the power of the resurrection coming, in that very act, to its own support.

ARTICLE IV.

MELANCHTHON'S DOCTRINE OF THE WILL.

BY REV. JULIUS F. SEEBACH, A. M.

"A honied flower from blackest earth,*
The crown of fame and praises worth,
Lies withered here in quiet rest,
By the fierce heat of life opprest.
The grateful bees have carried home
Honey from thence, to fill their comb;
Many a spider crept along it,
Many a poisonous worm has stung it;
Yet scathless, in this shrine it lies;
Its work is such as never dies."

So sang old Johann Mathesius in his elegy to the memory of Philip Melanchthon. It was a truthful summary of a fruitful but troubled life. For many years he wrought at the task God had set him, doing a work that none other in his time could do. They were years when thousands of eager students gathered from all parts of Europe to drink in the sweetness of his wisdom; they were years when enemies arose, and envy, like a serpent's trail, was seen across the path of his devout advance. He died; and psalms of thanksgiving were raised by more than one; but, in the absence of the body, even his enemies came to

**Μέλι-άνθος Μέλαν-Χθών.*

recognize the greatness of the spirit that once had moved in visible form among them.

What is thus true in general of Melanchthon's life is true in particular with reference to his conception and development of the doctrine of the will. No teaching of his was during his life less understood, or more severely attacked. Friends and foes alike caricatured it, and either in opposition or in advocacy carried the thought to extremes which were dangerous to the symmetry of truth. But the doctrine received its best vindication in the fact that his bitterest enemies were later forced to adopt it, in the form he had given it, as the expression of a necessary truth.

The doctrine of the will, however, had not always the same form and content in Melanchthon's mind. A study of his *Loci* and commentaries reveals three fairly well defined phases of thought. They may be designated as absolute predestination, moderate Augustinism, and synergism (so-called); and they follow thus chronologically in Melanchthon's development of the doctrine.

This order was inevitable under the circumstances. Determinism was psychologically necessary in opposition to the pretentious claims of scholastic philosophy for human powers. The papal theologians, in the interest of their system of doctrine, had over-exalted human powers and freedom in their relation to divine actions. Like begets like, even in opposition; and so the one extreme of a will entirely free was met by another extreme of will enslaved. Luthardt, with keen insight, has observed in this connection: "It is the universal law of historical development that the new, next only to its novelty, is conscious of its opposition to the old, and keeps itself entirely opposed to that; until, after it has won an assured stability, it seeks again the torn threads of union with the old. The adjustment then becomes an inner necessity and a morally ordered function."*

This is the order of development which we shall find in the thought of Melanchthon as we proceed. It is to his great

*Die Lehre vom freien Willen, sec. 7, p. 150.

honor that he went on from the beginnings of Christ in the Reformation to approximate the perfection that the limits of a lifetime could attain. Others there were who did not dare to face the truth with all its consequence as he did; to-day they lie embalmed in their own orthodoxy, while his spirit lives triumphant despite the cries of heresy.

And yet it is what we might have expected of Melanchthon. He was a scholar before he was a reformer; a humanist before he became a theologian; a searcher for truth rather than a framer of dogmas. There is apparent in all his thought—aside from his very first expression of it—the open-mindedness which passes no irrevocable judgment on anything that is subject to human conceptions. There is manifest, too, the culture that discovered in the world's experiences the high dignity of humanity, and has realized that the true glory of the Creator exists in the exaltation, rather than in the debasement, of his highest creatures.

This will be seen as the thought of Melanchthon is presented in the order of its development. But there is one consideration to be kept in view, in order that he may not be misunderstood. It is the practical religious standpoint from which all his observations are taken. The ethical element is predominant. What would be incorrect in his writings, were he appealing solely to the intellect, and establishing simply a system of dogmatics, becomes truth of no mean importance when we remember that he is writing from the standpoint of human action. We may wish at times that he had traced every question to its logical conclusion. But that he did not do, for reasons which we shall appreciate later on; and then, perhaps, we shall be glad he did not.

FIRST PERIOD—1519-1525.

ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION.

In the beginning, Melanchthon's doctrine of the will was nothing more than Luther's conception put into logical form. The reason for this is not hard to find. He was Luther's disciple, adopting his position and re-stating it in a manner consistent with his own scholarly spirit. If his presentation sounds

harsh and stern as compared with Luther's it is because of the greater intellectual factor, which reveals the logical consequences of such a position. But just because his argument was more strictly logical, says Luthardt, "so much more easily could the fallacy of the premises be perceived and overcome."*

Nor yet was this extreme position his own or Luther's alone; it was characteristic of the Reformation period. In Dorner's words: "It is well known that in every age in which the splendor and freshness of Christianity rose before mankind with new clearness, there is to be observed the most powerful emphasizing of absolute dependence upon God, and a return particularly to the Pauline exhibition of doctrine."† The Reformers, like the great apostle, had a highly developed system of work-righteousness to combat.

"There are two parts of man," says Melanchthon "the power of knowing, the power from which the feelings arise."‡ Of these, knowledge is subordinate, and "serves will," so that "they call by the new name of free will, will joined with knowledge."§ "Law pertains to the power of knowing; * * * to the power of the feelings, virtue, vice."|| Therefore "liberty cannot properly be said to fall in the category of knowledge,"¶ because it is subject to the will. What then is liberty? "To be able to do or not to do, to be able to do thus or otherwise.—Therefore it is called into question whether will is free, and how far it is free."** Thus briefly Melanchthon puts the question, and answers it immediately by an appeal to predestination: "Will in reference to predestination is not free either in good or in evil, either in external works or in internal affection."††

But this theological statement of the question is not sufficient. It does not satisfy every phase of the problem. A query concerning the moral, spiritual freedom of human will is answered by an appeal to the relation of God to his creation;

*Die Lehre vom freien Willen, p. 149.

†History of Protestant Theology, vol. I. p. 207.

‡Corp. Ref. XXI. 13, 86.

§C. R. XXI. 13, 77.

||C. R. XXI. 13, 87.

¶C. R. XXI. 14, 87.

**C. R. XXI. 14, 87.

††C. R. XXI. 14, 87.

as far as divine foreknowledge is concerned, nothing is free. But it is asked, "Is the will of man free in his moral acts? Can he do good and evil—can he do or not do?" Melanchthon therefore follows his philosophical discussion with a psychological consideration of the nature of man. This is really the more important argument, and should have had the first place, for the burden of proof rests upon it. To have given the psychological argument first, and then to have followed it with the theological and the accompanying Scriptural proofs, would have been more forcible. Melanchthon evidently saw this, for in the editions of the *Loci* of 1522–23, he reversed the positions of the two arguments, and greatly expanded the psychological.

"We will contemplate the nature itself of human will more closely," says Melanchthon, "so that the thoughtful may detect false sophists not only in theological matters, but also in the judgment of nature."* "If you judge the power of human will by the natural understanding, it cannot be denied, according to human reason, that there is in it a certain liberty of external works."† But external works have no moral significance; and so, "because God does not regard external works, but the internal motions of the heart, Scripture has recorded nothing about that liberty."‡ It is therefore a question of the "internal motions"—whether they are free. But "the internal affections are not in our power; for we learn by experience and use that the will cannot of its own accord lay aside love, hate, or like feelings, but feeling is conquered by feeling; so that, because you have been wounded by him whom you loved, you cease to love him. For you love yourself more ardently than anyone else."§ Wherefore it follows that the will is not free in moral activity, but that feeling is subject to feeling, and all to the supreme feeling for self.

But some one may say: "How does it happen that we men often choose something different from our feeling?"|| And the answer is, in the first place, that feeling is subject to feeling. "Alexander may love pleasure, but he loves glory more; so he

*C. R. XXI., 89.

†C. R. XXI., 90.

‡Ibid.

§C. R. XXI., 90.

||Ibid.

despises ease and endures hardship for the sake of glory."* In the second place, one might choose something "directly contrary to all the feelings." One might treat pleasantly him whom in his soul he hated. But this is mere appearance, an external act, a fiction of the intellect. The hate would still be hate.† Wherefore again it is proved that "the internal affections are not in our power," and that the will is subject to the rule of selfishness. "What matters it, then, to boast liberty of external works, when God requires purity of heart?"‡ "The Christian knows that nothing is less in his power than his own heart."§

It might be asked, however, whether this "love of self" might not desire the spiritual. But selfishness is the supreme feeling, and "the power from which the feelings arise is that by which we follow after or turn from that which is known."|| Since knowledge follows only the carnal sense, this supreme feeling in man must desire only that which is carnal—for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. 2 : 14). It can be clearly seen then, that this selfishness in man is of the essence of sin. The determining inclination of man is carnal, ignorant of God, sinful.¶ The constancy of Socrates, the chastity of Xenocrates, the temperance of Zeno, the philosophic morality of Plato and Cicero—all are tainted with self-seeking.** Hence the natural virtues of the heathen are only seeming virtues and real sins;†† for as the fire, according to its nature, strives upward, as the iron toward the magnet, so man follows after sin.‡‡ By such an argument as this Melanchthon proves the spiritual inability of the human will.

But there is more yet in the argument. It is a blow aimed at the scholastic contention for *meritum congrui* and *opera moralia*, by showing their impossibility.§§ To the natural man whose every act is sin, there can be no moral work, no merit, no contrition—not even a *bonum non meritorium*. And there is

*C. R. XXI., 90, 91.

†C. R. XXI., 91.

‡C. R. XXI., 92.

§C. R. XXI., 93.

||C. R. XXI., 13.

¶C. R., XXI., 114.

**C. R. XXI., 100.

††C. R. XXI., 100.

‡‡C. R. XXI., 97.

§§C. R. XXI., 110.

more yet; it is the approach to the predestinarian conclusion of the first argument. "Therefore there is not anything in our power, either internal affection or external work. * * * And all things happen as they are destined by divine counsel."*

It will be seen by the conclusion of these two arguments—the philosophical and the psychological—that the relation of free will to predestination is very intimate and important. In this first period, Melancthon considered it the chief argument. "But I may seem absurd," he says, "who at once in the beginning of a work argue concerning the most difficult point, namely, predestination. However, what does it matter whether in the first part of the compendium, or in the last place, I treat that which belongs to all parts of our discussion?"†

Melancthon's answer to the problem of the will is fixed in the will of God; hence he is unwilling that anyone "should be anxious about the subject of predestination, or dispute why God saves this one and damns that one, why he imputes to us what he himself has destined. For he is the Lord, he does what pleases him."‡ His summary in the *Loci* of 1521, however, shows best the extreme position he had taken. "If you refer human will to predestination, neither in external nor in internal works is there any liberty, but *all things* happen according to divine purpose. If you refer will to external works, there *seems by the judgment of nature* to be a certain liberty. If you refer will to the affections, there is plainly no liberty even by the judgment of nature."§ Even the seeming liberty of external works is after all only an appearance, for the judgment of nature itself is in bondage. And so the conclusion of the argument is absolute: There is no power in human will; there is all power in the divine.

But while the logical extreme of this argument is unequivocally set forth in the *Loci*, Melancthon presents its practical consequences most clearly in his commentaries, especially in that upon Romans, of 1522. Here especially in his comments on the 8th and 9th chapters, he combats the scholastic notion of a special

*C. R. XXI., 15.

†C. R. XXI., 89.

‡C. R. XXI., 15.

§C. R. XXI., 93.

and a general efficacy. All that happens, "happens according to necessity and divine determination."* Hence to say that the will is free "is a ridiculous fiction, since the will turns only whither it is driven."† There is no "permission" to sin on the part of God. His part is not passive, but active. Not only the calling of Paul is his own work, but also the adultery of David and the treachery of Judas.‡ And this rule is to be applied not only to temporal affairs;—but also to eternal destiny; for "he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9 : 18). If God is actively the author of good and evil, then all who are justified receive the gift of God, and all who are condemned are the "vessels of wrath" whom he has appointed.§ There needs to be added only the statement that the glory of God is the aim of this,|| and we have the argument in the extreme of harsh and unfeeling presentation.

The impression made by the teaching as a whole, however, is not fully in accordance with the final deductions. Scattered through the pages of the *Loci* and the commentaries there are passages that lighten the gloom of absolute predestination. Sometimes there seems to be a virtual denial of the truth of the final argument. The "glory of God" is lost sight of, in the attempt to answer the "cry of the human." Indeed, we are made to feel that the idea of the "glory of God" has no real inner connection with the rest of the thought. He must confess at times that there is a certain liberty of external choice.¶ More than once he must admit that "it seems too unpleasant to teach that man sins of necessity," and that "it seems cruel to blame the will for its inability."** Frequently, too, he loses sight of the double activity of God, and says of those who are under condemnation that "divine will has no part in their condemnation," but that "they reap only that which their sins have merited."††

*H. 1., a.

†H. 1., b.

‡H. 2., a.

§H. 2., a.

||H. 3., b. Cf. Luthardt, *Lehre vom freien Willen*, pp. 154-156.

¶C. R. XXI., 92.

**C. R. XXI., 86.

††Quoted from Galle, p. 256.

Yet the significance of these statements must not be used against the scope of Melancthon's system as a whole. The extreme conclusions were carefully considered, and intended for acceptance; but they were the outcome of logical necessity rather than the expression of his own desires. Predestination and unfree will might contain the thought of the present; the milder statements had prophetic significance for the future. Take them as we may, they afford more than a hint that Melancthon's heart was often at war with his head.

This is shown, too, by the purpose which he discovered in predestination. In the *Lucubrationcula* he speaks of it as a "great consoler." How he could extract "consolation" from a doctrine of such rigorous absolutism, it is hard to see, unless we consider that unconsciously his desires were supplanting his logic. The "glory of God" is forgotten as he contemplates the sublime mystery of predestination, and is assured, that "the divine goodness is of itself the summit and power of all things."* He has no doubt that "the necessity of predestination teaches the mercy of God in this, that certain ones are chosen independently of any merit."† He sees only the greatest impiety and misery in free will, because "we should be called away from God to ourselves."‡ And there is something almost pathetic in his words, when he says: "Far off in the future there is a time when you shall have worn off the carnal sense, so that you may know that nowhere else is there a surer consolation than that of predestination."§ It sounds as if he were strengthening himself. Though he did not recognize it as yet, Melancthon was not at rest in his conception of free will and predestination. And we, were we to judge from *all* he has said, should be certain that the near future would witness the recast of his thought.

SECOND PERIOD—1525-1535.

MODERATE AUGUSTINISM.

The precise moment when Melancthon became conscious of the need of remodelling his conceptions will never be known;

*C. R. XXI., 15-16.

†Quoted from Galle, p. 261.

‡C. R. XXI., 15-16.

§Ibid.

for a change so great "cometh not with observation." But the fact that after 1525 he refused to permit the original *Loci* to be reprinted may well allow us to adopt that year as marking the point of departure.

Some writers have seen in the controversy between Luther and Erasmus the reason for the change in Melanchthon's ideas of free will and predestination. That it would have its influence we can imagine, for Erasmus with consummate skill pointed out the untenable conclusions to which absolute predestination led. But this could have force only in connection with other experiences that had extended his horizon. Melanchthon's labors as professor of theology had brought him a fuller knowledge of the Scriptures. He could not conceal from himself that there were many statements in the Bible which were not in agreement with those he had quoted in favor of predestination. Indeed, the general impression made by Holy Writ was in opposition to that conception. Its universal warning and promises could not be brought into harmony with the particularity of election. Moreover, his ethical sense pointed out with increasing persistence the incompatibility of the authorship of sin with the holiness of God. Reason and Scripture alike demanded that God be freed from all such accusation. He could not help seeing, too, the inconsistency of referring guilt to a man whose sin had been wrought in accordance with the decree of predestination, and through the efficacy of God. To think otherwise in this respect were to impute insincerity to God in his gracious offers. And had he not seen in the school of experience how these doctrines had led in all sorts of extravagances? The vagaries of the Enthusiasts and their dire results in the revolution of 1522 had risen out of these deterministic teachings, removed as they were from moral considerations. Finally, to all this may be added the results of his studies among the early Church Fathers. He had formerly judged the ancient doctrine of the Church through the pages of Augustine. Further study had taught him that the earlier Fathers, especially the Greeks, held no such view of predestination as did Augustine. Surely these could not all be in error; and Augustine himself had in his earlier years ascribed

much to the capability of the will. With all these reasons for change claiming recognition, the modification of his original views was bound to come at last.

The first express statement of Melanchthon's changed views appeared in his commentary on Colossians, which was published in the Summer of 1527. Here, in an excursus on Col. 1 : 15 concerning free will, he takes up the questions of the authorship of sin, the liberty of the will, and the extent of its ability in self-determination.

He begins : "God governs things created, and moves them continually." But this at once introduces the question whether God is "not the author of evil, or of sins." Melanchthon appeals to Christ's words, John 8 : "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own," which proves that God is not the author of sin. He sustains all "life and motion," but the devil and the wicked misuse them. It will be seen at once that Melanchthon has withdrawn from his former position concerning the double efficacy of God. The scholastic distinction between a "general" and a "special efficacy" of God, which at first was almost scornfully rejected, is now adopted. God's continual activity in the creation and sustentation of all the powers needed by his creatures must be recognized, but in such a way as to exclude the unrighteous use of such powers on the part of man ; for the Scriptures plainly teach that God cannot work evil as evil. That one can stretch out his hand is God's work ; that he stretches it forth to evil is his own.

This suggests the question of free will, since God moves all creatures and yet does not move to sin. The problem must be modified, however. In this connection it is not a question of natural powers, or of our relation as creatures to God the Creator, but of spiritual powers, "whether without the Holy Spirit we are able to fear God, believe in God, love the cross, etc." To the question in this form there can be but one answer : "The natural powers of man cannot effect true fear of God, true faith toward God, and other feelings and spiritual movements"—as the Scriptures plainly teach (John 6, Rom. 8).

Nevertheless a certain liberty must be granted to the will.

It can choose food and clothing; it can govern the external members (*locomotiva*); it can even effect a "carnal and legal righteousness"—as the Scriptures say, "there is a certain righteousness of the flesh. But the explanation of this last admission grants to the natural will considerable moral ability. It can abstain "from slaughter, from theft, and * * * from another's wife." In this way it can satisfy the law to any degree whatever, and display conduct highly honorable and upright. On the other hand, two limitations to this freedom must be recognized. "In the first place (it is hindered) by the weakness of the flesh, or original sin; for there is a certain weakness of the flesh, so that evil affections often overcome all our endeavors. In the second place, the devil hinders liberty, who, because he has possession in all, often drives men to open and dreadful sins." Wherefore "reason alone is not always able to afford even legal righteousness." But such a righteousness has little value even in its own sphere; and so we are to "seek the aid of the Holy Spirit," in order that God's *special* efficacy may accomplish its full work in our hearts (See Luthardt, pp. 160 sqq.; Galle, pp. 275 sqq.).

Later in the same year, but much more briefly, Melancthon expressed the same views in the Latin sketch of the Saxon Visitation Articles which was published without his knowledge. The next year, the same articles in expanded German form were presented to the public, prefaced by a commendatory introduction by Luther. At the end of both editions the subject of free will was discussed in a general way. The treatment is very similar in form and substance to that of the commentary on Colossians; the same development, the same illustrations are used. But it is interesting to notice the reason that introduces the discussion—"Many speak in an extreme way about free will." It indicates that the reformers already experienced the necessity of combatting the results of their earlier teaching.*

In the following year, 1529, Melancthon issued his Exposition of Romans, in which he touched very lightly upon the

*See Galle, pp. 281-284., Luthardt, pp. 159-160.

questions of free will and predestination. The same year, in his Scholia on Proverbs, he sets the question entirely aside, "Do not peer into higher things," he says, "but always consider those things which God bids you. * * * Reason offends and is deceived when it inquires * * * whether we ourselves are elected. Questions of this kind are not profitable."* His reason for this silence was not far to seek; he desired to lead men's thoughts away from speculative questions which, in the exaggerated interest they aroused, kept from view the practical considerations of religion. If his opinion on these questions were desired, it could be found in his Scholia on Colossians, of 1527.†

The Augustana of 1530 maintains the same doctrinal position as the above-mentioned Scholia and Articles. Yet there is apparent a two-fold presentation that reminds us of the first period of unrest in Melanchthon's mind. There are expressions which seem to maintain all phases of conviction between absolute predestination and synergism. For instance, Art. 18, when it says man "cannot, indeed, without the divine aid, either begin or certainly accomplish what is becoming in things relating to God," seems to concede the beginning of good to man as a possibility. But if the words are taken in connection with Melanchthon's express statements in the Apology on this point, the fallacy of such a conclusion will be seen. So, too, Articles 5 and 19 seem to teach predestination both positively and negatively, when it is said—Art. 5—"the Holy Spirit is given, who, *when and where it pleases God*, works faith in those who hear the Gospel," and in Art. 19—"the cause of sin must be sought in the depraved will of the wicked, * * which, *when destitute of the divine aid*, turns away from God." But if in connection with the latter words we recall the oft-repeated thoughts of Melanchthon, that God has no part in evil *actively*, but only *permissively*, the obscurity vanishes. Nor is the former expression to be taken in any extreme way. The emphasis must be laid on "when and where," not on "it pleases God," and so the

*Scholia on Proverbs, p. 128 b. Galle, 284, 285.

†Brief Reason for Studying Theology, C. R. VII., p. 457.

clause must be understood in an historical sense; as if "God knew beyond doubt the time and season, and appointed it with himself, when he wished to call each one."* Moreover, the absence of any article on predestination in the Confession ought to be significant in this connection.

The same uncertainty is displayed in his new Commentary on Romans of 1532, but with a greater advance toward a new position. He could no longer acknowledge the "little forest of commentaries" that had been published in his name, because of their teaching; so he took this way of setting them aside. The difference is seen in the long discussion of predestination prefixed to the 9th chapter. He does not believe that Paul had election in mind in this passage, but rather the comforting of the saints, who were oppressed because of their own weakness in comparison with unbelieving Israel. Predestination, he says, "is mentioned briefly not to propagate idle questions, but to console the pious, who it was necessary should know that on one hand is the true Church, on the other the multitude of the wicked which claims title of the Church."† If the question were to be judged from the human stand-point, the conclusion would be very depressing; but the pious are not to be disturbed, for they are "to know that the Church is neither a natural production, nor multitude, nor human wisdom, but divine election forms it out of mercy."‡ If, however, predestination or election is the subject of inquiry, let the will of God be judged from his Word. But the promises of the Word are universal; wherefore it is impious to inquire after special election.§ God has conditioned the fulfilment of his promises on faith alone,|| so that "all are elected who believe this promise, and do not cast away this faith to the last."¶

This solution of the question, however, seems to grant to man a certain share in his own conversion. And this impression is deepened by his appeal to the Church Fathers, as against

*A. C., Art. XI., Sol. Decl., p. 56, From Luthardt, p. 166.

†Galle, p. 289.

‡Ibid.

§Cf. Galle, pp. 289-292.

||Luthardt, p. 168.

¶Galle, p. 292.

the conception of Augustine, and to Augustine himself in his earlier writings. He says "that the mercy of God is the real cause of election, but yet that there is some cause in the receiver, so far as he does not reject the offered promise." But he adds immediately, "Neither can the promise of mercy be received, nor trust be conceived, except by the Holy Spirit moving hearts through the Word;" and so the concession of one statement is met by the restriction of another.* The latter thought, however, seems to be the one consciously adopted; for it is a frequent conception of Melanchthon's that God is *creatively* active.†

The uncertainty that marks this period of Melanchthon's activity is not unlike that which characterized the close of the first period. Conceptions seem to waver, and predict a still further change; but in the confusion it is hard to draw the line of demarcation. Galle thinks Melanchthon had already changed his position in 1527; certainly before he wrote the Augsburg Confession. Luthardt is assured that the Confession was composed under the best influences of the second period, and that Melanchthon's indecision began to appear only in the Commentary on Romans of 1532. Herrlinger will recognize neither the original absolute predestination, nor the later elements that suggest synergism. He refers all change to the developed ethical sense, and fixes the limit of the second period as late as 1552.

The difficulty is largely removed, however, if we bear in mind the spirit that animated Melanchthon at this time. He had seen on the one hand how barren of results, and how open to constant misunderstanding for the practical affairs of life, the dogmatic treatment of religion became. On the other hand, he realized the paralyzing effect of proclaiming man's passivity under the gracious operation of God. Moreover, such teaching seemed in the highest sense untrue. God's Word was not a book of magic, but an eloquent appeal to the moral sense; men were not "blocks" or "statues," but self-conscious and self-

*Galle, p. 293., Luthardt, p. 169.

†Cf. Luthardt, p. 170.

determining beings. The more he recognized this, the greater became his efforts to supply the need thus discovered.

It is a question whether Melanchthon ever abandoned his moderate view of predestination. From the stand-point of abstract thought it is unlikely that he ever departed from the conclusion expressed to Brenz in 1531: "You subtly, and apart from predestination, infer that his own place is assigned to each one, and you reason rightly."* But abstract conclusions were not the necessary things just then. Humanity had been overburdened with the quiddities and quoddities of scholastic theology; it must not again be asked to bend the back to a similar burden. And so, without giving up his earlier position, Melanchthon strove to satisfy the practical claims of religion. If we have to-day a theological system that counts nothing human foreign to itself, it is because this prince of theologians thought it his highest duty to frame Christian doctrine for human nature's daily needs. Consequently, it is not necessary for us to see here a revolution in conception; but rather a re-disposition of thought in accordance with the deeper claims of the ethical sense.

THIRD PERIOD.—1535–1560.

SO-CALLED SYNERGISM.

There are several objections to the use of the term synergism to denote the character of the third period. It is not true in the historical sense, for the thought of Melanchthon is far removed from that of Pelagius, and he himself expressly condemns the errors of the Pelagians. Melanchthon never taught that the natural powers could inaugurate the beginnings of the new life, or be competent for inward obedience to God without the Holy Spirit. It is not true in the sense of Semi-Pelagianism; for though he held that the human powers were not utterly destroyed, he yet never adjudged any merit to human exertions, like Cassian and his school. It is not true in the technical sense, because a study of the entire period fails to show a single instance in which Melanchthon made the human will coördinate

*C. R. II., p. 547., Cf. Galle, p. 287.

with the Word and the Holy Spirit. It is always subordinate in action and secondary in time. It is not true in the common acceptation of the term, for its ordinary use has given the word a suspicious content that does injustice to Melanchthon's conception. His teaching lends no countenance to the notion that there are parts wrought separately by grace and by the human will in conversion. Grace is conceived by him to be active for good in all that is accomplished, though the will, because of its nature, is not passive and unresponsive. And yet the term may be used if we remember the above modifications, because there is no other to take its place, and because it expresses from the human standpoint the actual state of affairs in conversion. Individual experience teaches that the will of man is "not indeed idle," and that the Holy Spirit does not exercise his activity upon a "block or a statue."

It had been evident for a long time that Melanchthon was not satisfied with the second form of the *Loci*. The fact that he had stopped its publication in 1525 was sufficient witness to that. For ten years he delayed remodelling it in conformity to the alterations of his thought, only promising now and then that the work should be done. And yet it could be easily seen by consulting his publications during that time, especially the Commentaries on Colossians (1527) and on Romans (1532) what direction the emendations would take. At length, during the summer of 1533, he delivered a course of lectures on the elements of Christian doctrine, on which was based the new *Loci* issued in 1535. And this event must be taken as marking the final change in Melanchthon's conceptions. True, there were minor changes afterward; but, from this time on, the general trend of thought was fixed.

It would be useless to take up all the questions that are treated in this edition of the *Loci*, for most of them are in no wise different from the form given them in the commentaries above mentioned. What must be of chief interest to us in this place is his discussion of free will, and more particularly, the extent of human powers. And so we may set aside the allied questions of necessity and contingency, of general and special

actions, and consider that which gave so much occasion of stumbling to many.

Let us begin with this frequent thought of Melanchthon's: "Man cannot satisfy the law of God; for the divine law demands not only external deeds, but internal purity, fear, faith, the highest love of God, and, finally, perfect obedience."* Since, however, this is impossible to corrupt nature, it must be added, "The human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to cause spiritual feelings."† But this is not to "deter men from the pursuit of obeying or believing, or not to attempt it. Rather, since we ought to begin with the Word, surely we must not resist the Word of God, but strive to yield to it, and consider the promise of the Gospel, which is universal. Moreover in real tests this can be judged more clearly than in idle disputations. * * * But although the will struggles with weakness, yet because it does not cast away the Word, but sustains itself by the Word, it obtains consolation. And the Holy Spirit is efficacious thereto through the Word, just as Paul says, Rom. 8 : 26 : The Spirit aids our infirmities? In this struggle the mind is to be exhorted to retain the Word by every endeavor. * * * In this example we see that these causes *unite*, the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the will, not indeed idle, but striving against its infirmity."‡

There will be no need of examining the other writings of this period, for the above words contain substantially all that is set forth in them. Of course, in the changing circumstances of after years, the different questions were discussed according to the needs of the moment. Sometimes Melanchthon seems to go still farther, as when, in the *Loci* of 1548, he inserts Erasmus' definition of free will—"the faculty of applying oneself to grace."§ At other times, his words seem to indicate a reaction toward a stricter view, especially the writings published after 1552, in which liberty is restricted to the government of the outward members alone.|| And yet there is no essential departure from the central position that "free will does something."¶

*C. R. XXI., 875.

†Ibid.

‡C. R. XXI., 376.

§C. R. XXI., 659.

||C. R. XXII., 148, et al.,

¶C. R. XXI., 657.

But now the question must be whether in the above words—and consequently in this whole period—Melanchthon advanced the doctrine of synergism in its complete form. At first thought this seems to be true, especially in the statement of the three causes of conversion. The will seems to be made co-operative with the Holy Spirit and the Word, since it is “not indeed idle.” This impression is deepened when we read of the Holy Spirit “aiding,” “assisting,” *adjuvare*, the will in its struggle toward God, as if the will were the principal active agent, and the Spirit only accessory.* Moreover, when Melanchthon says, in the *Loci* of 1548, “aroused by the promise, we struggle with ourselves,”† all creative agency seems to be removed from the Spirit’s activity through the Word.

Let it be again insisted upon, however, that Melanchthon’s position throughout is eminently practical; he is arguing from the midst of experience. This is his meaning when he says: “These things understood rightly are true, and practice in the exercise of faith and in true consolation * * * will make plain this union of causes—the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the will.”‡ Consequently his language is not to be taken in a technical sense; rather is it to be understood as the medium of one who adds to his teaching exhortation.

If this is remembered, most of the difficulties disappear, and the rest are not insurmountable. In this way Melanchthon no more denies creative activity in conversion to the Spirit than does Paul when he writes, Eph. 5 : 14; “Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead; and Christ shall give thee light.” In both instances, the expressions are rhetorical, but yet agree in a practical way with reality. In like manner, the argument from “*adjuvare*” is robbed of its power. A study of the word, as it recurs in connection with the Spirit’s activity upon the will, proves that it is used to eliminate the idea of compulsion and to vindicate the ethical character of conversion.§

*C. R. XV., 619; XXIII., 282; XXI., 377, 663, XVI., 192.

†C. R. XXI., 659.

‡C. S. XXI., 660.

§C. R. XVI., 198; XXI., 656, 761, 891; XXIII., 290, et al., Cf. Herrlinger, pp., 91, 92.

Add to this that the word was used by Augustine, and by Melanchthon in the days of his absolute predestinarianism,* and the argument for synergism on this point will be destroyed.

Nor can the inference of synergism on account of the "three concurrent causes" be allowed. This is another instance of the rhetorical use of a word. In the technical sense, there is no "coöperation of causes" here. If the whole argument is taken, it will be seen that Melanchthon expressly denies to the human will the capacity for "perfect obedience." Without the Holy Spirit, man is impotent. If there is to be a beginning, it must be inaugurated by the Holy Spirit through the Word, the will not resisting. Consequently, in the moment of inception only two causes are really operative, and there is no real "coöperation." Immediately after, however,—not separable in point of time—the aroused activity of the will concurs with the other two causes, but not in the sense of equal coöperation; for "the human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to cause spiritual feelings."† Strictly speaking, this coöperative activity on the part of the will should be called "sub-operative;" in that way we should come nearer to the actual content of the "will not idle," that must at all events "do something." Everywhere Melanchthon insists on the divine initiative, and on the continued preëminence of the heavenly agents. In his latest writings he emphasized this position and worked out the details with greater clearness.‡ But he added nothing new to the argument already advanced, that the will ethically considered is active in conversion, but yet that the Spirit through the Word accomplishes all spiritual motions. He only elucidates his former position when he says: "It is perfectly plain that no man, by his natural powers, can banish death and the inborn evil inclinations, but God alone effects this."§ And so there is sufficient reason to believe that Melanchthon never taught the doctrine of synergism in any but a practical way.

*Cf., C. R. XXI., 47.

†C. R. XXI., 375.

‡Cf. Herrlinger, *Theol.*, Melanchthon's, pp. 99, 106.

§C. R. XXII., 153, 161; XXIII., 433; IX., 339.

It has been regretted that Melanchthon was forced by the circumstances of his busy life to develop his system of doctrine in such a fragmentary way. Moreover, it has been considered a misfortune that his ethical sense forbade the composition of a strictly scientific dogmatic. It is true that many advantages would have arisen from such a production by one of so much authority, and so admirably equipped for the task. We may well believe that theological terms would have attained the last degree of precision, and that all knowledge in this field would have had its perfect adjustment to all other parts. But it is a question, after all, whether the loss would not have been greater than the gain.

However, the time was not propitious. The early experiment of Melanchthon in the field of absolute predestination had demonstrated the preëminent need of education for the masses in the practical affairs of religion. Moreover, that time of many new ideas clamoring for recognition was not the time for systemization. The theories must all be subjected to the test of time and experience before that could be done. The controversies during Melanchthon's own life are sufficient proof of that; for most of them would not have occurred if men had not been carried away by false premises which had their only support in logical processes.

But Melanchthon was wise in his choice. If the position he took was so open to misunderstanding, despite the many avenues that lead into the heart of its truth, what would have been the result if the other side had been adopted, where knowledge does not pass beyond the bare fact, where imagination fails, and of which Christ himself says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit"? Not that he neglected any part of divine truth. Melanchthon emphasized the necessity of the divine activity of grace just as much as the ethical activity of man; but with Socratic wisdom he did not presume to explain things he could not know.

We may be glad that Melanchthon's thought took the direc-

tion it did. If our theology to-day has that "sweet reasonableness" which brings into loving knowledge of God, it is because of his untiring efforts in that direction. This is the legacy of the "*ἡθιμός*:" of the Reformation to his spiritual descendents afar off. Like the prophecies of old, his message was to keep its richest gifts for those who in the light of larger days should read the meaning of his words. Since the stormy ages of theological controversy have passed, and the day of practical religion has come, men are better able to appreciate the greatness of the spirit that wrought in patience for humanity, and turned not aside after shadows.

ARTICLE V.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD A PENTECOSTAL CLIMAX.

By REV. HIRAM KING, A. B.

THE GENERAL SUBJECT.

The fatherhood of man is established, not in the sphere of direct creation, but in natural generation. The race is multiplied, not by direct creative acts, but in man's generative function, and men become parents only as they beget children. Were man to become childless, it is plain that the elimination of his fatherhood would be inevitable as well as the termination of his natural existence.

As touching the propagation of the race in natural generation, there are two essential features that distinguish true fatherhood: (1) that the child is generated from the *person* of the parent; (2) that in the process of generation, the *nature* of the parent is transmitted to the child.

These are the well-known conditions of the fatherhood of man and the race is propagated under their constant operation, the subsequent development of childhood into manhood being safeguarded by parental guidance and guardianship. Do the spiritual conditions of the fatherhood of God correspond to the natural conditions of the fatherhood of man? Is the father-

hood of man really the portraiture, in general outline, of the fatherhood of man? Analogical deduction will warrant the affirmation of the interrogative proposition.

The fatherhood of God, like the fatherhood of man, is not established in direct creation. Childhood is the sole and necessary condition of fatherhood, but God does not create children by direct acts, either under the domestic roof-tree, or in his spiritual kingdom. Of all the race, indeed, he thus created only Adam and Eve and they were not children. Fatherhood being then possible only in connection with childhood, it is certainly quite plain that the direct creation of the first man and the first woman did not make God the Father of the human race.

The natural fatherhood of God cannot be proven from the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15 : 11). The question as to whom the younger son represented can be intelligently determined only from the *occasion* of the parable. The Pharisees and Scribes had disapproved of the Lord's gracious attitude toward the publicans and sinners (V. 2), and he directed the parable against their objections. As the publicans and sinners had renounced their religious obligations and had come to the Lord to hear him, they evidently were themselves the real prodigals. The younger son therefore represented, not the Gentile nations, but the graceless Jews.

The fatherhood of God is established, not in his creative function, but in the sphere of regeneration. The process of regeneration, moreover, like that of natural generation, culminates in *child-birth*. The subjects of regeneration are therefore the *offspring* of God. The race are now begotten anew, not of man, but of God. Man is "born again," not at the hearth-stone of the home, but at the font of the Church.

Is then the child of God, like the child of man, generated from the *person* of its progenitor? Certainly. The person of the progenitor is the only medium of generation, the progeny being the "fruit of his loins."

In regeneration, moreover, as in natural generation, the *nature* of the progenitor is transmitted to the progeny. A man, although distinguished from other men, is nevertheless the dupli-

cate of his natural ancestor to the extent of being wholly human. Does he, then, in his birth of God become divine? He partakes of the "divine nature" (2 Peter 1 : 4), but, being the "new man" (Eph. 2 : 15), he remains also human.

Is, however, the divine nature simply *added* to man in his new birth, his human nature remaining unchanged? and does the new man therefore lead a dual life—half human? half divine? The question has a most important bearing on this discussion, and the correct answer will point, as a finger, to the key of the entire logical and exegetical situation, namely, the Person of Christ.

No one would seriously contend that the divine nature, as transmitted in regeneration, comes only into *conjunction* with the human nature of its subjects. That would not be the new birth, nor, indeed, any birth, and would, moreover, be out of harmony with both reason and revelation. Origin in birth, quite the contrary, involves the *constitution of being*, and therefore implies the *unity* of all the constituents in personality. Conjunction of components may be possible in mechanics, but is not in generation. As the new birth is quite as real as the natural birth, it is plain that the divine and the human elements must be *unified* in the being of the new man.

Regeneration implies, however, not the transformation of the old humanity in its subjects, but the transmission of the new humanity to them from God. The conclusion is therefore fully warranted that human nature, to be thus transmitted in the new birth, must be *generic* in God.

This logical outcome, that God, as the Father of man in the sphere of regeneration, must be *human* as well as divine, implies evidently the incarnation itself, the climax of the Old Testament economy. Does reason, however, bear the test of revelation? Do the Scriptures justify the logical conclusion from the premise of man's regeneration, *that God has become incarnate*? Yes, just as the discovery of the new planet justified the astronomer's conclusion of its existence from the premise of its influence. Not only do the Scriptures declare that the

Second Person of the Holy Trinity "became flesh" (John 1 : 14), but the four Gospels are his biography.

At the beginning of the discussion, regeneration was assumed as the sphere of the fatherhood of God because it is an obvious, and, therefore, undisputed fact. Regeneration itself, however, proceeds from Christ as the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15 : 45), who is therefore not the *Creator* of the new man but his Progenitor. The ultimate ground of the fatherhood of God is, accordingly, not the regeneration of man, but the Person of Christ.

Christ is the author of man's regeneration because it is in him that God is incarnate. He is equally human and divine, inasmuch as his Person was constituted by the union of the human and divine natures. Christ is, moreover, not an ordinary member of the race, aside even from his divinity. He not only derived human nature from his mother, but he assumed the order of human life, and thus became *generic* for man's spiritual generation. The new humanity was therefore potentially in Christ as the natural race was originally in Adam.

The new creation, which thus originated in Christ, is an *order* of existence quite as much as the natural creation. In either realm, principle and law are regnant. The sole medium of introduction into either order of life is, moreover, the generative function. Natural humanity can be propagated only in generation from men. Spiritual humanity can be brought into being only in regeneration from God. As, now, the regenerative function is not in the being of God as such, but is in the Person of Christ, and as, moreover, the Person of Christ was constituted only in his birth of the Virgin Mary, the decisive conclusion follows, *that the new birth is limited to the Christian era.**

As however, the generations under the old covenant were the

*It is true that Scripture terminology represents God as Father aside from the actual incarnation (Ex. 4 : 22, Deut. 14 : 1, 32 : 6, Isa. 63 : 16, 64 : 8, Jer. 31 : 9, Acts 17 : 28, 19). The sense in which the paternal relation is predicated of God is, however, not uniform (Deut. 32 : 6, Isa. 64 : 8, Acts 17 : 28, 29), and cannot, therefore, imply his true fatherhood in every case, nor, indeed, can it in any case, because it is not based on the true *generation* of man from him. Out of Christ, God is without the generative function, and the fatherhood of God can be only metaphorical or typical.

people of God (Ex. 3 : 8), were they also his children? it may be asked. As well might Cain have been born before the creation of the *first Adam* as a child of God before the birth of the "last Adam." The law of cause and effect is, indeed, the necessary order in the spiritual realm as well as in the physical universe. Revelation, like nature, is *orderly*, and the order of procedure, in either sphere, is from cause to effect. As, moreover, an effect is *produced*, the priority of its cause is plainly indispensable, and therefore *invariable*. As touching the origination of the natural universe, it is evident that the sequence was from cause to effect, since "God created the heaven and the earth." As the new creation *also* was produced and is therefore an effect quite as clearly as the natural creation itself, the priority of *its* cause in the *Person of Christ* cannot even be doubtful.

It is thus demonstrated by logic that the new birth could not precede the incarnation. Does revelation, however, confirm the deductions of logic? Yes.

The Jews in the time of Christ were "an holy nation" (Ex-19 : 6) quite as much as their forefathers had been. They observed the ordinances of the old covenant and enjoyed its grace. Their *religious status* was the highest attainable by man prior to the incarnation, and they were challenged by the higher relation in Christ as *being already consecrated to Jehovah*. They were, indeed, "his own" people (John 1 : 11) to whom the Messiah "came." Did God, however, treat them as his *children* in their transition from Judaism to Christianity? No, as will appear from the following :

1. God's message to the Jews by the forerunner of Christ was, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3 : 2). The contents of the message were, first, that the Jews must repent as a preliminary to their entrance into the kingdom of heaven; and, second that the kingdom of heaven was, as yet, "at hand." It is but every day reason that the Jews, although the "chosen" and "peculiar" people, could not have been the "new man" for fifteen centuries before the establishment of the kingdom of heaven.

2. The Lord himself declared to Nicodemus that a man's

admission to new covenant relations depended wholly on his *new birth* as the condition. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3 : 5), he said. Evidently, Jew and Gentile alike must receive spiritual birth at the font of the Church.

If, now, the Christian philosopher is to assume the regeneration of the Jews under their economy, he also, like this Jewish teacher, will ask in perplexity: "How can these things be"? For clearly the Jew could not be regenerated the *second* time any more than the natural birth can be repeated.

3. St. John writes that the Lord gave those of his people, who received him, the "right to become children of God" (1 : 12). These original believers were not only Jews, but they were the best Jews, and yet they were only "born of God" (John 1 : 13) after the advent of Christ.

4. According to St. Paul, Christ broke down the "middle wall of partition" (Ep. 2 : 14) between Jew and Gentile, that he might "create in himself of the twain one new man" (Ep. 2 : 15). The origin of the new man is here referred, not to Judaism, but to the Person of Christ, in whose assumption of human nature, the distinction of Jew and Gentile was thus lost in the new creation. Since therefore Christ "created" the new man "in himself," it is perfectly plain that the regeneration of man did not precede the incarnation.

Although the Person of Christ is the source of the new creation, the actual Regenerator is, not Christ himself, but the Holy Spirit. The descent of the Third Person of the Trinity was as necessary for man's *personal regeneration* as was the advent of the Second Person for the new creation itself. It is, indeed, the function of the Spirit, and not of Christ, to consummate the new birth (John 3 : 5, 6, 8). The order of revelation itself was : (1) the advent of Christ ; (2) the glorification of Christ ; (3) the descent of the Spirit. These were not disconnected events in the course of revelation, but the stages of revelation itself in its historical development, and the order of their sequence could not possibly have been different. The first stage developed into the second, which was the exaltation of Christ.

The second stage developed into the third, which is the sphere of man's new birth. The *practical* climax of revelation was therefore, not the birth of Christ, but the gift of the Spirit. At Christmas, men were *spectators* of the divine benevolence; at Pentecost, they became its *subjects*.

That the descent of the Spirit *was thus* the normal outcome of the ascension of Christ and therefore could not have preceded that event, is not left in doubt. "For the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7 : 39). Thus affirms the apostle. "For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send him unto you" (John 16 : 7). This is the Lord's way of indicating the sequence of revelation. He, moreover, instructed the disciples to "wait for the promise of the Father" (the gift of the Spirit).

That Pentecost was, indeed, the culmination of the advent of Christ is also not to be called in question. The Lord did not "go away" *as into retirement* and "send" the Spirit *as his successor*. To the contrary, the ascension of Christ was not the interruption of his advent, but his emancipation from natural conditions in the *spiritualization* of his Person. The ascension was therefore not the withdrawal of Christ, but the climax of his advent. Indeed, the incarnation itself, as the essential union of God and man in the birth of Christ, made his presence with man perpetual as he himself declares: "Lo, I am with you alway" (Matt. 28 : 20). The Lord's announcement of his departure and the contingent descent of the Spirit (John 16 : 7) was, accordingly, equivalent to saying that he would be translated into the spiritual order, and that the Holy Spirit would regenerate men from his Person in the power of his incarnate life *thus glorified*.

As the Holy Spirit was not to "speak from himself" (John 16 : 13) but reveal Christ exclusively (John 16 : 14, 15), and as, moreover, in Christ there "dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily" (Col. 2 : 9), it clearly follows that Pentecost was the supreme self-revelation of God for the institution of the new creation. In its Pentecostal expression, then, revelation reached

its true, historical climax, and is not unitarian but Trinitarian. It was, indeed, the revelation of the *Economic Trinity* in the world, that was signalized by the supernatural display at Pentecost, and the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are at the sacred font to give birth to the new man (Matt. 28 : 19).*

The final Pentecost of Judaism became thus the practical institution of the Christian era, and the new economy is in the sharpest contrast with the old. "The day of first-fruits," from field and vineyard in Palestine, has now changed character as fully as did the Jewish Passover on the eve of Calvary. It is now the feast of "first-fruits" in the world's new creation, with *men* for grain, and when the day is done, the reapers have already borne into the garner three thousand sheaves from the fields "white unto the harvest." Men formerly turned their faces to the future and trusted in the Messianic promise; they now trust in the Messiah and enjoy the grace of the Messianic advent. The "last days" have come, and God "has poured forth of his Spirit" with the unexampled effect foretold by the prophet, "And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts 2 : 17-21). God has, indeed, done a "new thing," having made "a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert" (Isaiah 43 : 19). The apostles of Christ, upon

*The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost did not imply his prior exclusion from the world and his non-activity among men. The agency of the Spirit was, indeed, a prominent feature of pre-Christian revelation all along. The Spirit participated in the work of creation (Gen. 1 : 2), combatted evil in the heart of man (Gen. 6 : 3), made handicraftsmen skilful (Ex. 31 : 3), qualified men for military leadership (Judges 6 : 34), made the prophets the spokesmen of God (2 Peter 1 : 2), came on Saul and changed his heart (1 Sam. 10 : 6, 9), was the author of the miraculous conception of Christ (Matt. 1 : 20), descended on him at his baptism (Luke 3 : 22), and led him into the wilderness (Luke 4 : 1).

When, however, the Lord declared that the Spirit's coming was contingent on his own departure (John 16 : 7), he assumed that he had never come at all in the sense in which he would "send him." The Spirit should, indeed, be the *administrative Mediator* between Christ and man (John 16 : 14, 15). The *Pentecostal* mission of the Spirit is, therefore, to carry into practical effect the advent of Christ, by giving spiritual birth to men form the Person of Christ, and making concrete in their lives the grace of the new covenant.

whom his mantle fell (John 20 : 21), are now "baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 1 : 5) and have received "power" (Acts 1 : 8) to begin a truer world-conquest (Matt. 28 : 18-20) than that by Alexander. The kingdom of heaven is no longer "at hand," but established, and men are "born of water and the Spirit" (John 3 : 5) as the condition of the celestial citizenship. Men are now babes, not in the cradle but in Christ, and are therefore *new creatures* (2 Cor. 5 : 17). These are plainly the first-born of the "last Adam," and God is at length the Father of man.

THE SPIRITUAL STATUS OF THE JEWS.

As the fatherhood of God was not established in Judaism, what was the spiritual status of the Jews?

1. *The Jews were not saved from sin in Judaism.* The truth of the proposition will appear in contrasting the offerings by the Aaronic priest for expiation and the offering by Christ.

It is axiomatic in soteriology that salvation is not possible without forgiveness of sin, and that forgiveness of sin is necessarily associated with the new birth. Since then the Jews were not born of the Spirit, it follows that sin was not abolished, and that therefore salvation was not accomplished under the old covenant. Do the Scriptures confirm the conclusion? And do they imply the lack of soteriological provisions among the Old Testament institutions?

As touching the *source* of salvation, St. Peter thus sounds the key-note: "And in none other (than in Jesus Christ) is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4 : 12). As the "name" of Jesus Christ was not "given among men" till the close of Judaism, it is quite plain that it was not even in the Jewish vocabulary. How then could the Jews have *spoken* this *open sesame* to salvation? The Lord indeed became the "author (cause)* of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5 : 9), but only through the sufferings of his natural life (Heb. 2 : 10). How then could the Jews have been saved, since the "cause" of

*See *Airios*.

salvation did not even exist contemporaneously with Judaism? Or could the effect have *lawlessly* preceded the "cause," notwithstanding the Jewish economy was the world's most rigid system of *law and order*?

That the salvation of man in the forgiveness of sin *followed* the Messianic advent, appears indeed from the general declaration of purpose at the institution of Christianity itself. Then the Infant Messiah was to be called Jesus (Matt. 1 : 21). "For it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1 : 21, Jer. 33 : 16), the angel Gabriel explained. Zacharias prophesied that the Messianic proclamation would be "to give knowledge of salvation unto his people in the remission of their sins" (St. Luke 1 : 77). The Baptist pointed out the Lord as the "Lamb of God which taketh the sin of the world" (John 1 : 29). St. Peter declared that God exalted Jesus to be a "Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins" (Acts 5 : 31). All this is, moreover, the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy of the Messianic epoch, that God would make a new covenant with his people, put his "laws into their mind" and write them "on their heart," and that he would be to them "a God" and they should be to him "a people"; and, furthermore, that their sins would he "remember no more" (Heb. 8 : 8-13).

The new covenant is the proper, historical advance of revelation from the old covenant, and therefore cannot be its *duplicate*. Wherein, then, do the two covenants differ? It is plain that the distinguishing features of the new covenant were to be, first the *laws of God in the mind of the people and on their heart* (regeneration), and, second, the *remission of their sins*. It is equally plain that the prior existence of these new covenant features was quite impossible. For if they had *characterized* the old covenant, they manifestly could not *distinguish* the new.

The Scriptures, indeed, declare the *inadequacy* of Old Testament expiation for the removal of sin. On the day of atonement, the Jewish high-priest, as the divinely appointed mediator of the Old Testament, sprinkled the blood of the "bullock of the sin offering" and the blood of the "goat of the sin offering"

at the mercy-seat within the veil. At the "end of the atoning for the holy place," he laid his hands on the head of the scapegoat at the altar before the tent, confessing over him the sins of the people, and then sent him into the wilderness bearing them (Lev. 16 : 5-22). Such was the atonement for sin under the Mosaic dispensation. As to its merits, the Scriptures, however, declare as follows: "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10 : 3, 4). To like effect is Hebrews 9 : 6-10. The priests entered continually into the "first tabernacle" (holy place) and ministered at the golden altar (v. 6). The high-priest, however, entered the "second" (holy of holies) only once a year, and not without an offering of blood for himself and the people (v. 7). The Holy Ghost thus "signified" that the way into the divine presence behind the veil was not made "manifest," while the first tabernacle was yet standing (v. 8). It would, indeed, seem that the Holy place, as separated from the holy of holies, was a "parable," and signified the utter inadequacy of the Jewish rites of expiation to secure forgiveness of sin, and thereby satisfy the moral self-consciousness (v. 9). The sacrifices themselves are, accordingly, characterized as having been "only carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation" (v. 10.)

To the contrary in every particular did Christ minister at the heavenly mercy-seat. He sent no scapegoat into the wilderness; nor did he bear into the spiritual tabernacle the reeking oblation of Judaism. Priest and victim in one, he was the Lamb of God in self-immolation. In this unique offering, there was not "a remembrance made of sins" (Heb. 10 : 3), but Christ was "manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9 : 26). "He loosed us from our sins by his blood" (Rev. 1 : 5). Unlike the Aaronic priest, "he entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9 : 12). The writer to the Hebrews explains, furthermore, that the self-offering by Christ was final, because it was adequate to the removal of sin; "Now where remission of these (sins and iniquities) is, there is no more offering for sin (Heb. 10 : 18).

As touching the expiatory merits of the two covenants, respectively, and their consequent soteriological bearing, they are set in contrast by the following passage: And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: But he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God (Heb. 10 : 11, 12). The sacrifices by the priests were offered daily, because they could "never take away sins." The one sacrifice by Christ was offered "forever," because it abolished sin.

This revelation here also confirms the findings of reason, the plain teaching of the Scriptures being that the sin offerings of the Jews did not take away sin. Salvation was indeed impossible in Judaism for want of a Saviour, just as the new birth itself was impossible for want of a spiritual progenitor.

2. *The Jews were in grace.* It is "by grace" that men are saved in Christianity (Ep. 2 : 8). But it does not follow that Judaism was *without* grace because the Jews were not saved. "By the grace of God I am what I am" was as true a self-estimate by the Jew as it was by the Christian. It was, indeed, by divine grace that the marvels of the Jewish history were wrought from Abraham to Christ. Moses received divine consecration at the "burning bush" to lead the Jews out of Egypt, and to formulate their politico-religious institutions at Horeb. His shepherd's staff became the "rod of God," and made its bearer greater than Pharaoh. It was endowed with *sacramental qualities*, and became the medium of divine intervention in behalf of the Jews. It was by means of the rod that Pharaoh was compelled to let the people go; that the bottom of the sea became a high-way for their escape into Arabia; that the late herdsmen of Goshen were transformed into victorious warriors at Rephadim, and that the "rock" was made a fountain.

It was, however, in his own proper person that the great Jewish lawgiver was the mediator of God's gracious manifestations to his people. He parted the waters of the Red Sea in Egypt, and the *typical* "day of Pentecost was now come." In their baptism "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor.

10 : 2), the Spirit fell on all the people to abide with them as the constant inspiration of their religious institutions. A fit type this of the Christian Pentecost, when a high-way should be made through a redder sea (Rev. 7 : 14) than that of Egypt, that men might be baptized in the Archetypal Deliverer himself (Gal. 3 : 27), escape from a greater tyrant (Heb. 2 : 14, 15) than Pharaoh, and enjoy a better freedom (John 8 : 36) than that of the Arabian desert. Not only, however, did the people receive spiritual consecration through Moses but they ate "spiritual meat," thereafter, and drank "spiritual drink." Although the reference is to the miraculous supply of the daily hunger and thirst of the Jews, the assumption is surely warranted that the manna and the rock-fountain represented, for their faith, the truer "spiritual" meat and drink of the soul. St. Paul indeed calls the "rock" Christ (1 Cor. 10 : 4).

At Sinai, Moses was even the *mouth-piece of God* for the promulgation of the ordinances of the Theocratic constitution, and the appointment of the rites and ceremonies of the Old Testament religion. When subsequently, tabernacle and temple were filled with the divine glory, and the Shechinah hovered over the mercy-seat, God was increasingly helpful and gracious to his people through the ministrations of his representatives, the priests. He heard their prayers at the golden altar when they rose on the cloud of incense; accepted the sacrifices they offered in faith; and sent them the holy prophets with the messages of his grace.

The Christians are saved by grace, but only through faith (Eph. 2 : 8). Had the Jews faith, notwithstanding Judaism was without saving grace? Yes, and the conclusive proof of the affirmation is contained in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. The writer, in the first place, presents such an array of believers as is not elsewhere catalogued; and, in the second, he declares that none of them "received the promise" (v. 89). Although the Messianic promise was, as yet, not fulfilled, the Old Testament people were not only believers, but their faith was invincible.

Was the faith of the Jews, however, concerned wholly with

the future, and was it therefore without present fruition? No. The contents of the Jewish faith was promise in its *ideal* fulfillment, since it is the function of faith to thus give typical reality* to "things hoped for" (Heb. 11 : 1). The grace of the Jewish faith was the Messiah in his *ideal* advent, which was most real, for it was the "shadow of the good things to come" (Heb. 10 : 1). The contents of the Christian faith are, however, "the good things" themselves, and these, in their final analysis, are Christ. The Jewish faith was therefore the medium through which the "shadow" of *Christ* was thrown forward many centuries, Abraham himself seeing thus the "day" of Christ. It was, accordingly, the "shadow" of Christ that was the marvelous grace of Judaism from the beginning, and under whose influence the Jews were "an holy people unto the Lord" (Deut. 14 : 2) and became heroes of faith (Heb. 11 : 1-40).

The Jewish economy was then clearly *preliminary*—elementary in a measure—to the kingdom of heaven. The light of Judaism was the dawn of day, presently to be glorified into the morning of Christianity. This pre-Christian twilight was the reflection of the "true light," which was, as yet, below the horizon. The light of Judaism was therefore the type of the world's coming illumination, just as the dawn in nature is the type of the day it heralds. The dawn in the moral sphere is produced by the rising luminary as much as the dawn in nature is thus produced. Since, moreover, the dawn is really the indirect light of the sun, it must needs partake of the nature of the day, itself, into which it is glorified at sunrise. Judaism, therefore, partook of the nature of Christianity, and the Jews were in the opening twilight of the "day of Christ," which broke in radiant splendor upon the new earth at Pentecost, as the "sun of righteousness" began to ascend the ecliptic of the new heavens.

As to the spiritual status of the Jews, the following declarations seem to be warranted :

1. It is quite impossible that the scapegoat could have car-

*See *Ἰνόςτασις*.

ried into the wilderness the sins of the people in annual installments, or that the blood of his slain associate could have washed them away at the mercy-seat.

2. The expiatory rites of Judaism were typical, and could therefore only symbolize the real expiation to be made by Christ.

3. The ordinances of Judaism, though "carnal," were, on the one hand, the means of Old Testament grace, and, on the other, they held in *abeyance the evil powers* until the time of "reformation."

4. The entire ceremonial system of Judaism was typical, and was therefore the medium through which the "shadow of the good things to come" was projected into the life and experience of the Jews, under power of their faith.

5. The Jews were in grace as the children of God (Gal. 4 : 1, 2), but their spiritual childhood was typical, since they received "the adoption of sons" only at the advent of Christ (Gal. 4 : 5).*

6. The grace of Judaism was the *ideal* Christ, become visible to faith in the Old Testament day-dawn of Christianity.

THE INVISIBLE CHURCH ALSO CHRISTIAN.

When men became the children of God, historical Judaism was assumed into the higher order of Christianity, and ceased to exist. It was, indeed, in the nature of things that the covenant with Abraham should end with its fulfillment in Christ. Only those Jews, who were loyal to the Old Testament obligations and maintained the purity of the Messianic faith, really represented Judaism at the advent of the Messiah, and they became *Christians* when they "received" him. It was, indeed, "of" both

*It would hardly do to apply the figure of a minor son to the Jews (Gal. 4 : 1, 2), without limitations. The Lord was sent to redeem the Jews from the law (Gal. 4 : 5). He accomplished their deliverance by suffering the curse of the law on the cross (Gal. 3 : 13). The practical emancipation of the Jews depended, however, on their personal acceptance of the crucified Christ, and it is certainly quite plain that their faith in him involved their *new birth* (1 John 5 : 1, John 1 : 12, 25). While therefore the minor son *develops* into his majority, the Jew was *born* into his.

the Jew and the Gentile that the Lord created the "new man" (Ep. 2 : 15), and the "new man" is neither Jew nor Gentile, but Christian. The Jew, accordingly, ceased to exist, ecclesiastically, at Pentecost.

Did, now, the Holy Spirit fall on the believing dead in his Pentecostal effusion, and were they also "born again" as the new creation was thus inaugurated among the living? Did the Jew cease to exist among the dead as well as among the living? and did the invisible Church, therefore, become Christian as well as the visible Church? It would seem so. Judaism could not exist contemporaneously with Christianity, in the world to come, any more than in the present. It is manifestly out of the nature of things, that, in the vast community of the righteous dead, there should still exist the religious distinctions, which marked the stages of revelation from Adam to Christ. It is not reasonable that the faith of the dead should be Patriarchal, or Jewish, or Christian according to the periods of revelation in which they respectively lived. It cannot be that the Jewish dead have still only the "shadow of the good things to come," and are yet trusting in the Messianic promise, while the Christian dead possess the *substance* of the "good things," and enjoy the grace of the Messianic advent. The personal faith of the dead cannot be thus diverse. For how could the Church, being thus without homogeneity, possibly be the "body" of Christ (Ep. 1 : 23), and the "true vine" (John 15 : 1-8), since both figures imply, not only the similarity of all its members in form; but also their oneness in essence. The Church among the living and the dead must indeed always have been identical with itself, whether Patriarchal, Jewish or Christian, since the invisible Church is really the visible Church transplanted, with all its increasing light and growing life. Death being neither the mental nor moral negation of its subjects, the dying believer goes not into the darkness, but bears with himself the revelation which he enjoyed in life, to add to the general illumination in the world to come. It is plainly not possible that the primitive believers should still remain in the semi-darkness of the Patriarchal period, since the invisible Church has been illumi-

nated, for ages, by such brilliant lights as the prophets of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New. How, indeed, could those be ignorant of the Lord's advent, with whom he was present from Good Friday to Easter Sunday? Nor can any one imagine that when St. Stephen had committed his spirit to the Christ whom he saw in glory (Acts 7 : 55-59), he presently found himself in a *Jewish* communion of departed saints. Christ is, indeed, the Head of the Church for the believing dead as much as for the living (Phil. 2 : 9-11), and as all believers are members of his "body," they must all be *Christians*.

As now, the Headship of Christ was established in the new birth of the Church at Pentecost, it follows that the invisible Church became Christian then as well as the visible Church.

That the advent of Christ *is thus* extended to the invisible Church is clearly taught in Hebrews 11 : 39, 40. The writer having named the illustrious believers of the generations before Christ, declares that they "receive not the promise" (v. 39). He furthermore declares that God has "provided (or foreseen) some better thing concerning us" (v. 40). The "better thing" could only be the *fulfillment* of the "promise" in the institution of Christianity. The pre-Christian believers, it appears, were not "made perfect" (v. 40) "apart from us" (v. 40), that is, not before God had provided the "better thing concerning us." When therefore the "better thing" *was* provided in the advent of Christ, the contingency ceased to exist, and the Old Testament believers who could not be "made perfect" *apart* from us were manifestly "made perfect" *with* us.

All believers were thus baptized with the One Spirit to profess one faith in the One Lord, and the One God became the Father of all.

ARTICLE VI.

MORMONISM, ITS HISTORY, DOCTRINES, STRENGTH,
METHODS AND AIMS.

BY REV. P. ANSTADT, D. D.

Mormonism is one of the sorest plague-spots of our body politic. It originated 70 years ago, and during the first 40 years of its existence was regarded as a harmless delusion, which would soon pass away. But quite the contrary has been the result. Since its establishment in Utah it has grown in the number of its adherents, in wealth, power and influence to such an extent, that the whole country has been aroused to a sense of the danger threatening our Christian civilization from the influence of Mormon polygamy. Especially since Utah has been admitted as a sovereign state of the Union, and since a professed and practical polygamist has been elected to a seat in Congress, in defiance of the solemn obligation that polygamy should be discontinued, has the nation been aroused to indignant opposition, and most earnest and numerous signed petitions have been sent to Congress opposing his admission to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Especially has the League for Social Service, under the superintendence of Dr. Josiah Strong, of New York, entered into a vigorous campaign against Mormonism. This League has, up to this time, published and distributed broadcast over the whole country, about *one million* of Anti-mormon Leaflets. These leaflets are small tracts or pamphlets, in which the which the following subjects are discussed :

No. 1. "Methods of Mormon Missionaries," by Rev. Wm. R. Campbell, (12 years in Utah.)

No. 2. "Present Attitude of Mormonism," by Rev. R. G. McNiece, D. D., (21 years in Utah.)

No. 3. "Historical Sketch of Mormonism," by Rev. D. J. McMillan, D. D., (10 years in Utah.)

No. 4. "Articles of Faith of the 'Latter-Day' Saints,' with Mormon Explanations," Compiled by Rev. J. D. Nutting (5 years in Salt Lake City) and Rev. D. J. McMillan, D. D.

No. 5. "Political Aspects of Mormonism," by Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D.

No. 6. "Ten reasons why Christians can not Fellowship the Mormon Church." Issued by the Presbytery of Utah, and endorsed by the Congregational and Baptist Associations of Utah.

No. 7. "Reasons why B. H. Roberts should be expelled from the U. S. Congress."

Send 2 cents postage for Annual Report and specimen leaflet.

Sample copies of these seven leaflets were sent *free* by mail to 50,000 ministers, Christian Endeavor Societies, Young Men's Christian Associations etc., over the whole country, and fully 800,000 copies have been sent by freight and express in packages of from one hundred to several thousand, to persons, churches or societies ordering them. All this literature has been sent free of charge, except transportation for freight or express. All the expenses incurred by the publication of this enormous amount of literature have been met by voluntary contributions; one wealthy and benevolent lady alone gave her check for \$6,000.

When at the opening of Congress, in December last, Brigham H. Roberts presented himself to be sworn in as a member elect from the state of Utah to a seat in the House of Representatives, objections were at once raised against his reception and a committee was appointed to investigate his right to a seat in the House.

The committee after a thorough investigation brought in two reports, a majority and a minority report. The former recommended his exclusion, the latter that he be sworn in and seated, and then immediately expelled. The committee was therefore unanimous on his rejection, but disagreed only on technical points of procedure.

On the 25th of January the vote was taken in the House of Representatives and resulted in his rejection by a majority of 278 to 50.

But the war against Mormonism has not been ended by the exclusion of Brigham H. Roberts from a seat in the House of Representatives; it has probably now only fairly begun. The Mormons will likely raise the cry of persecution, appeal to the sympathy of the people, and make renewed efforts to propagate their abominable system. They are still sending out missionaries to make proselytes not only in every state in the Union, but also in most of the European countries. Quite recently some thirty or more of these missionaries of "the Church of the Latter Day Saints" sailed from our ports to England, Germany and Scandinavia. It is therefore proposed to continue the publication of anti-Mormon literature, still more extensively not only in the English language but also in translations into the German and Swedish languages.

My object in this way is, to compile from the anti-Mormon leaflets a brief abstract of the history, doctrines, methods, numerical strength and political influence of Mormonism.

Mormonism originated 70 years ago. During 40 years of this time it was regarded as a harmless delusion which would soon pass away; but quite the contrary has been the result, and the sooner the nation realizes the growing power of Mormonism the better it will be.

The Mormons date the origin of what they call their church from Palmyra, N. Y., April 6, 1830, with 6 members; namely, Joseph Smith, Jr., his brothers Hiram and Samuel H. Smith, Peter Whitmer and David his brother and Oliver Cowdery.

The family of Joseph Smith claims to be of Scotch extraction, and to have lived in New England ever since 1700. The mother was a fortune-teller, and both parents were illiterate. They were among the people who followed a strange delusion under one Wingate, who by the use of what he called "St. John's Rod," claimed to be able to discover gold, silver, currents of water underground, medicinal roots and to cure all manner of diseases. They also harped much on the lost ten tribes of Israel, their restoration and a "latter day glory." The whole movement proved to be a scheme of a band of swindlers. Wingate, the leader, was arrested but escaped justice.

Joseph Smith's birth occurred about the time when the Win-gate delusion was at its height. He grew up without refinement. His parents were ignorant, indolent and intemperate. He had health and strength and an active mind. Being without school advantages, he followed his own crude ideas. He was about fifteen years of age when he began to see visions and dream dreams. He was absent from his father's house seeking employment in various capacities.

A Rev. Solomon Spaulding, of Pittsburg, Pa., had written a novel which he called the "Manuscript Found." He advanced the theory that the Indians of this country descended from two colonies, one of which came from the town of Babylon; the other many centuries later from Jerusalem. Mr. Spaulding died without having his manuscript published. A Rev. Rigdon, a sensational preacher, then also residing at Pittsburg, became deeply interested in this novel and must have copied it, and changed it by introducing many passages of Scripture, so as to make it appear to be a revelation from God.

During his wandering Joseph Smith was for a time in the employ of William H. Sabine, at whose house the widow of Rev. Spaulding was making her home. In the garret of the house he found stowed away in an old trunk Mr. Spaulding's "Manuscript Found." Soon after his return to his father's house he was visited by Rev. Rigdon, who had in the meantime removed to Mentor, O., where he had gathered a large congregation. These two were also joined by Parley P. Pratt, a traveling tinker and preacher of some ability, also a member of Rigdon's church. Mr. Pratt plied his twofold vocation between Palmyra, New York, and Mentor, Ohio, and was a great admirer of Mr. Rigdon.

After his acquaintance with Mr. Rigdon in 1827 Joseph said, he was told in dreams and visions, that he was chosen of the Lord to be a great prophet, to restore the gospel which had been taken from the world many centuries ago. He went so far as to declare that an angel came into his room at midnight, awoke him, read 5 chapters out of this Bible to him and then took him to a hill which he called Cumorah. The hill is four

miles from Palmyra, and is owned at present by Admiral Sampson. There Joseph claims to have discovered the wonderful Mormon plates and unearthed them by the help of the angels. He describes the plates as bound by rings in the form of a book and concealed in a stone vault, where they had been hidden from the wicked world 1400 years. The plates, he says, were four inches wide and eight inches long, and about as thick as ordinary tin sheets, forming a book about six inches thick.

Joseph concealed himself behind a curtain (which was a bed-blanket), stretched diagonally across one corner of his mother's kitchen, and there read, what he claims, was a translation of the engravings on the plates, to a scribe who sat outside of the blanket, and heard what Smith pretended to read. Thus the *Book of Mormon* was produced. Eleven men testified that they saw the plates, but none of them were able to read anything that was engraved on them, so that we have only Joseph Smith's word for what they contained.

Immediately after the translation of the plates the Mormon church was organized. Joseph Smith was baptized and ordained by Oliver Cowdery; then Oliver Cowdery was baptized and ordained by Joseph Smith.

In October the number of members had increased to about 75. The Rev. Sidney Rigdon became an enthusiastic convert. He said it was that light which he had been long expecting to break forth from the divine mind. Of course the whole of Mr. Rigdon's peculiar church at Mentor, O., was at once absorbed.

When the Mormon church was organized only 5 of the 11 witnesses joined it. Oliver Cowdery, one of these and the one that acted as scribe, were cut off from the church a few years later and turned over to the buffetings of Satan, for lying, theft and living in open adultery with a servant girl. Cowdery died a miserable drunkard. Martin, another of the five, was also cut off for wickedness, and Joseph Smith said of him that he was not fit for decent people to notice. Two others of the original five, and witnesses of the plates, were, after some years, sent to jail for immorality and crime, and then shot by a mob who broke into the jail.

Kirtland became the headquarters of the church where a temple was erected at a cost of \$40,000. But the establishment of a fraudulent bank led to their being driven out from the community by the indignant citizens. According to Smith's own testimony he and Rigdon had to flee from justice at midnight.

Three kinds of charges followed Smith everywhere up to his death, namely, *immorality*, to cover up which the doctrine of spiritual marriages and the practice of polygamy began to be justified as early as 1836. A second charge, which invariably followed him, was *dishonesty* in matters of money, as the Kirtland bank scandal shows. A third charge was *theft*. To justify this crime he asserted that Mormons were God's peculiar people, to whom it was God's purpose to give the whole world and all that is therein. "For the meek shall inherit the earth," and the Mormons were the only meek people.

In 1832 Brigham Young, from Boston, a painter and glacier, became a convert. He first met Smith in the fall of that year at Kirtland, and was the first to use the gabble called "the gift of tongues."

The next effort at permanent settlement was made at Independence, Jackson Co., Missouri. Joseph Smith said, "This was the centre of the earth, the site of the ancient Garden of Eden." But there were sturdy settlers in advance of the saints, who had rights which they were unwilling to surrender to the Mormon prophet. Trouble followed and war ensued, in which the Mormons were defeated. They then moved to Nauvoo, Illinois. Here a beautiful city was built, and here they grew in strength and numbers. Intoxicated with prosperity and popularity the prophet became reckless. With an utter disregard of the rights of others, he appropriated property and wives. Evil reports and quarrels followed. The prophet was arrested again, but the saints secured his release and justification at any cost.

In 1844 Dr. R. D. Foster and Wm. Law, editors of a paper in Nauvoo, openly charged them with having taken Mrs. Foster as a spiritual wife. The city authorities, being under Joseph

Smith's power, punished these gentlemen and destroyed their press and types. A warrant was issued for Smith's arrest, but he resisted the officers. Governor Ford persuaded him and his council to yield their arms and place themselves under the protection of the militia. The prophet and his three associates were conducted to Carthage and lodged in jail for safety. There 5,000 Mormons were in arms and their safety seemed assured. But three days after a company of Missourians, numbering 200 armed and masked men, assaulted the jail and killed the prophet and his brother Hiram Smith and wounded John Taylor. The blood of these so-called martyrs proved, indeed, the seed of the Mormon church. Sympathy for the saints, who claimed to have been persecuted, because they were holy and good men, won them friends in this country and in Europe. The success of Mormonism was assured.

Sidney Rigdon now wanted to be prophet—but Brigham Young assumed the reins of government. He told the saints, that God had called him to the throne, and that, together with his strong will, settled the succession. Rigdon, disappointed in his ambition for leadership, left the church forever.

The conflicts between the Saints and the Gentiles was irrepressible. Brigham Young had not the courage to face it. Accordingly the long journey to the Rocky Mountains was undertaken, which ended at Salt Lake in 1847. There they were within the boundaries of Mexico, safe from the pestering power of the "Babylonist" government of the United States. But much to their chagrin, the fortunes of the Mexican war brought them again under the dominion of the hated government. However, they were beyond the probable reach of civilization, and undisturbed, they have been for 50 years defiantly entrenched in these mountain fastnesses. Here the prophet had things his own way, with none to molest or make afraid. To justify the peculiar habits of the priesthood a pretended revelation, making polygamy a condition of exaltation in the next world, was conveniently received. To give it sacredness and added force it was dated back to 1843 and ascribed to Joseph Smith, the martyr prophet. But the trans-continental travel was increas-

ing, and the isolation of the saints threatened, therefore gentiles must be kept out and apostacy prevented. So the fertile brain of that master of men, Brigham Young, devised the doctrine of "Blood-Atonement." This means, that the only way to save the soul of a gentile or apostate is to shed his blood. The "Reformation" set in. The Mountain Meadow massacre occurred in southern Utah in 1857, when at least 120 gentile emigrants were massacred, and their horses and money confiscated, enriching the church by many thousands of dollars. The massacre in the valley of the Rio Virgin, the murder of the Morrisites, the outrage committed upon the Brassfield boys and the assassination of the Parishers, all show how the doctrine of the "Blood-Atonement" was practically applied to destroy outsiders.

The laying of the foundation of the temple in Salt Lake City, the establishment of the perpetual immigrant fund, the hand-cart expedition across the plains, in which hundreds of enthusiastic, but misguided emigrants perished, the "Order of Enoch" devised by the prophet, which required them to have all things in common, by which the innocent saints were victimized, and the priests enriched, mark this period of Mormon history.

But a better order of things was established under the military arm of the government of the United States. Under governmental protection gentile miners began to develop the great resources of that country. In due time the Union Pacific railroad reached Utah and outside capital and enterprise came in. The hills and valleys began to smile with awakening life. Salt Lake City was changing, civilization came into contact with Mormonism at every point. The day was dawning and the common people rejoiced.

While Utah was a territory the strong hand of the nation was felt. The executive and judicial officers were appointed by the President of the United States, and the acts of the territorial legislatures were subject to the gentile governor's veto and also to the revision of Congress. With the increasing number of gentiles and apostates the country was prospering, but Mormonism was crumbling. It was evident that

Mormonism could not hold its own in comparison and in contact with Christianity. It must live alone and gather its converts from abroad. This was its only hope. It won no converts from its neighbors. And its loss by apostacy was about equal to its gain by immigration, while the power of the priesthood was growing weaker. Something must be done to save the Mormon ship from wreck. By pretending to quit the practice of polygamy, and promising to be good, decent people, and law-abiding citizens they induced Congress to admit Utah into the Union. But as soon as the Mormons got control of the government they forgot their promise, renewed the practice of polygamy and insulted the people of the United States by electing a polygamist to Congress.

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

The articles of Mormon faith are abominable, and some of them shocking to every feeling of Christian refinement. Here are a few of them copied from their own publications and catechism :

"God was once what we are now, and is an exalted man."

"Adam is our forefather and our god, and is the only god with whom we have to do."

"The head god called together the gods, and sat in grand council to bring forth a world."

"Are there more gods than one? Answer: Yes, many."

"When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden he brought Eve, *one of his wives* with him."

"Each god through his wife or wives raises up a numerous family of sons and daughters, for each father and mother will be in condition to multiply forever and ever."

"Jesus Christ and the Father are two persons in the same sense that John and Peter are two persons, possessing every organ, limb and material part that man possesses."

"The purest, most refined and subtile of the substances is that substance called the Holy Ghost."

"There is no other god in heaven, but that god who has flesh and bones."

"These gods are therefore subject to the necessary laws which govern all matter."

"You think our god is not a lively, sociable and cheerful man ; he is one of the most lively men that ever lived."

"Question : Was it necessary that Adam should partake of the forbidden fruit ? Answer : Yes, unless he had done so, he would not have known good and evil here, neither could he have had mortal posterity."

"Question : Did Adam and Eve lament or rejoice, because they had transgressed the commandment ? Answer : They rejoiced and praised god."

"It is a dreadful thing to fight against, or in any manner oppose the priesthood."

Their priesthood gives them the right to advise and instruct the saints, and their priestly jurisdiction extends over all things spiritual and temporal.

"No man need judge me," writes Brigham Young. "You know nothing about it, whether I am sent or not ; furthermore, it is none of your business, but only to listen with open ears to what is taught you, and serve God with undivided heart."

They claim that the Bible in its present state is not a perfect guide. "Who knows," say they, "that even one verse of the whole Bible has escaped pollution, so as to convey the same sense now that it did in the original ?"

"Willard Woodhoff is a prophet, and I know that he has a great many prophets around him, and he can make scriptures as good as those in the Bible."

Here is a quotation from Brigham Young's paper, the *Desert News* : "We have the *greatest and smartest liars in the world*, the *cunningest and most adroit thieves*, and any other shade of character that you can mention. We can pick out elders in Isreal right here, who can beat the world at gambling, who can handle the cards, can cut and shuffle them with the smartest rogue on God's footstool. I can produce elders here who can shave their smartest shavers, and take their money from them. We can beat the world at any game, because we have men here

that *live in the light of the Lord*, that have the holy priesthood and hold the keys of the kingdom of God."

Much more of such abominable doctrines might be quoted from the periodicals and catechism of the Mormons, but I will refer to only one more, one that is shocking to every devout believer in Jesus, and must be regarded as a horrible blasphemy and perversion of Holy Scripture. It charges even the Lord Jesus Christ with being an actual polygamist.

Apostle Orson Hyde, president of the twelve apostles, said in a sermon, Oct. 8, 1854 :

"If at the marriage of Cana in Galilee Jesus was the bridegroom and took unto him Martha, Mary and the other Mary, whom Jesus loved, it shocks not our nerves. If there was not attachments and familiarity between our Saviour and these women highly improper only in the relation of husband and wife, then we have no sense of propriety. We say it was Jesus Christ who was married, whereby he could *see his seed* before he was crucified. I shall say here that before the Saviour died *he looked upon his own natural children as we look upon ours*. When Mary came to the sepulchre she saw two angels, and they said unto her, 'Woman, why weepest thou? She said unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord or husband.' "

METHODS OF MORMON MISSIONARIES.

The Mormons have been increasing very rapidly during the last few years, and it is interesting to know the reasons of their phenomenal growth and the means employed to augment their numerical strength. Mormonism grows neither because of its merits as a system of moral or religious truth, nor alone by appealing to the depravity of human nature.

Mormon missionaries are sent to all parts of the United States of America and to most countries in Europe. When they come into a new community they do not make themselves known for some time. They first spy out the land, and find out all they can about the condition of local church life, who are professing Christians and who are not. As a rule they find little difficulty in proselyting those who are weak in faith, or dis-

satisfied with their church relations. There are generally two of them; they make "a friendly call," and make themselves agreeable and become acquainted. They represent themselves as Christian missionaries who go two and two like the seventy, sent out by the Saviour, without money and without pay. The leader introduces himself very pleasantly and asks your name. Then he introduces his friend Mr. So-and-so, when they will probably say: "We are strangers in this place, but have come to stay, and we want to become acquainted with the people. It is for this purpose that we have called upon you; and we hope that our acquaintance may prove to be mutually beneficial."

If they find you an earnest consecrated Christian, they will see that there is not much hope of converting you to Mormonism. But if they find you dissatisfied in your present church relation, they will ask to what church you belong, and if you name your church connection, they will probably ask, "Do you attend church regularly?" If you reply, "Not very regularly," they will probably ask, "Why not?" If you say, "I don't feel like going all the time," they will likely ask, "Why don't you feel like going all the time?" And if you say, "Because the minister is not eloquent," they will probably say, "well he ought to be eloquent if he is a true ambassador of Christ. Indeed, he ought always to speak with the demonstration and power of the Spirit. Who does not so preach proves that he speaks without authority and does not deserve a hearing." Should you answer, "I do not feel like going to church, because there are class distinctions in our congregation which prevent me from feeling at home there," these wily Mormon "elders" will encourage you in this feeling that the fault is with the church, the minister, or some one else than yourself. Perhaps they will say, as they often do, "Well, no one can blame you for not feeling at home in a church where such things exist. We should not feel at home in such a church ourselves. In the Church of Christ all the members are brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus; and one person is just as good as another, no matter whether he has fine clothes or as much money or not." They quote from the Bible such passages as the following: "The rich and the poor meet

together; the Lord is the maker of them all," to prove to you that your church is not in harmony with the Bible, and therefore not a true church. If the "elders" were honest, they would tell you there are greater class distinctions in their "Latter Day Saints" church than in any other.

Probably about this time the "Elders" will put into your hands a tract to show how far the churches of to-day have drifted away from the ancient simplicity which characterized the New Testament Church; or if they have made you feel that you have found in them the best friend you ever had, you will likely ask them, who they are, and they will answer, "We are Christian missionaries. We are here to do all the good we can *free of charge*. We travel without purse or scrip, just as the seventy in the days of Christ. In fact we are the seventies, chosen just as the ancient seventies were, and we are on the same kind of mission they were called to fulfill. If we can give you any advice we shall be glad to do it, but we cannot advise you to continue going to a church or listening to such a minister as you have been telling us about, for they are evidently not truly Christian."

Possibly by this time they will tell you, that as they are travelling "without purse or scrip," and as the servants of God are depending on the generosity of the people among whom they labor for support, you will feel like inviting them to dine with you, or even to make their home at your house while in your neighborhood.

When they think the proper time has come they will say, "We are missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (thereby misleading all who never heard the Mormon church called by that euphonious name). "We believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the same as all other Christians do," (thereby leaving the impression that they believe in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, which they do not).

"We believe in the Bible as the Word of God given by divine inspiration" (not intimating that they believe also in their Book of Mormon, which is better adapted to these times than the Bible). "We hold some views which are a little different from the views of other denominations; but we do not ask

any one to believe anything which we cannot prove by this Bible," (holding up the Bible).

In this way they proceed with all the principal doctrines of the Christian Church. The final proposition is their doctrine of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to Acts 8 : 17, 18. Then they proceed to prove that no one is authorized to administer the ordinances except the Mormon priesthood.

If they can get you to accept this conclusion and join their church they will lead you to believe that God is a polygamist, and that men may become gods by practicing this abomination. They will, moreover, by the same methods lead you to accept the Mormon priesthood as the "mouthpiece of God," whom you must "obey in all things temporal and spiritual." They will thus enslave you and make you pay tithes for their support, while they go round pretending to preach "without purse or scrip," in order to get more money out of those whom they are leading astray.

When the Mormon "elders" approach your door or invite you to their meetings, your only safety lies in remembering the words of Christ: "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

PRESENT ASPECTS OF MORMONISM.

As it regards the present aspects of Mormonism, it must be said, that as a condition of admission into statehood they solemnly promised that Polygamy should cease among them; yet since their admission into statehood they have ignored their promise, and polygamy is taught and practiced in Utah, just as it was before. They have even had the audacity to elect one of their leading polygamists, who is now living with three wives, as a member of Congress.

In regard to the present numerical strength of Mormonism and the efforts for its extension the following is reported:

The Mormon Church has maintained more missionaries over the country in the past two years than ever before—about 1700

in all. They have gone into nearly every north-western, eastern and southern state (two of them are operating in the city of York now). Nor have they gone in vain. For it was stated in the annual conference in Salt Lake City last April, that these missionaries the previous year had secured 63,000 converts. They have congregations and centres of influence in many of the eastern and southern cities, and are very industrious in disseminating their mischievous doctrines, sugar-coated with Christian phraseology. Gen. Eaton of Washington, D. C., in his pamphlet, entitled, "The Mormons of To-day," reminds us that the census of 1890 reports 1058 Mormon communicants in Nebraska; 1,106 in Kansas; 1,336 in Wyoming; 1,396 in California; 1,540 in Michigan; 1,762 in Colorado; 5,303 in Iowa; 6,500 in Arizona and 14,972 in Idaho. In Utah the Mormons are about three fifths of the entire population, which is about 280,000.

Mormonism never had so much political power as to-day. It virtually controls Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Arizona, and in a close election would hold the balance of power in other states, thereby securing in Congress quite a group of men, naturally ready to oppose any legislation which the Mormons might not like.

THE POLITICAL ASPECTS OF MORMONISM.

In the beginning of 1897, the Mormons were about one-half as numerous as the congregationists. During that year, (the last for which we have Mormon statistics) the Congregational churches gained about 12,600, the Presbyterians 17,000, the Methodist Episcopal 19,700, the Mormons 63,000. With a membership only one-fifteenth part as large as these three denominations, the Mormon Church gained some 13,000 more than all of them put together.

They make a great boast of what they intend to do in the future. In 1880 Bishop Sunt said: "Like a grain of mustard seed was the truth planted in Zion; and it is destined to spread through all the world. Our church has been organized only fifty years and yet, behold its wealth and power. This is our

year of Jubilee. We look forward with perfect confidence to the day when we shall hold the reins of the United States government. That is our present temporal aim; after that we expect to control the continent."

From the above it will be seen that Mormonism as a religious system is a conglomeration of nearly all the false religions in the world. It has something of Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Jesuitism, Pharisaism and Materialism, all bound together by the most imposing rites and oath-bound covenants.

In its rise and rapid progress, pretended revelations from heaven, polygamy, blood-thirsty cruelty, political intrigue and aim at universal empire it strongly resembles Mohammedanism, which has been and is yet a curse to the world. God grant in mercy, that Mormonism may not become a similar curse.

ARTICLE VII.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIC.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

In order accurately to estimate the value of this compilation from the teachings of the old dogmaticians we must know the purpose of the author, and in order to know his purpose we must understand his theological environment. For some decades back the fruits of the last century's Rationalism among the laity had been pretty thoroughly undermined by certain powerful preachers and teachers of practical theology, among whom were Pflaum, Krafft, Schubert, Karl von Raumer, Claus Harms, Loehe, Ludwig Harms and Fliedner. And up out of this spiritual soil of a revived church life sprung, as a natural fruitage, a more spiritual theology. Schleiermacher also contributed greatly to this change, for though we cannot accept many things he taught, all, or almost all, agree that he more than any other individual was responsible for the change that swept over Germany during the forepart of this century, a change which meant on the one

hand the overthrow of the worn-out Rationalism of the last century and on the other the preparation for and the actual beginning of the new confessional theology of the middle and latter half of this century, which is not new in the sense that it contradicts the Old Theology, but rather in the sense that the superstructure of a building is newer than the foundation on which it rests.

At the time Schmid compiled his book, there were four theological camps in Germany whose lines of division were sometimes indistinct. First of all there was the almost deserted camp of the 18th century Rationalism, which nevertheless exerted some influence, though, perhaps, chiefly by the remembrance of its former power. Then there was the Monistic Tuebingen School of Baur and his associates which was in its most flourishing and aggressive period. And though Schleiermacher did not found a separate school, there were certain theologians that were closely related to him and are classified by Frank as representatives of a theology that was called forth by his work. Among them were Twesten, Nitzsch, De Wette, Richard Rothe, Hase and Schweitzer. And though they followed him as their leader they all departed from him in certain fundamental principles, in fact Hase and De Wette were somewhat confessional, the former being perhaps best known by his *Hutterus Redivivus* (appeared first in 1828 and has passed through 12 editions), which essays to present the truth as Hutter would have taught it had he lived in the beginning of this century. The other class of theologians, to which Schmid belongs, embraced all those who in their theology turned back to the confessional inheritance of the Church.

After Rationalism had received its death blow, the theology that sprung up was confessionally indifferent. This prevailed even at Erlangen which was then and has ever since been noted for its vigorous confessional Lutheranism. A clergyman who was a student there at this time (*i. e.* 10 or 20 years before Schmid published his book) wrote to a friend:—'There was as yet no confessional consciousness among the devout students, which was not to be expected when you remember the charac-

ter of the times and the condition of theology. And if according to our opinion we were all good Lutherans it must be taken rather in a personal than in a churchly sense, namely, that Luther stood before us as the respected ideal of a German Christian man. We even regarded our honored Krafft (Reformed Prof. of Practical Theology) as a good Lutheran because in the pulpit and in the professor's chair he often referred to Luther's authority and cited suitable passages from his writings.* Frank characterizes this as "an exact presentation of the condition of affairs." At this time, 1825-1845, such men as Tholuck, Julius Mueller, Hengstenberg, and Dörner were supporting the cause of "Positive Union" even in dogmatics. When Schmid published his book the number of the confessional Lutheran theologians was very small. J. T. Beck represented "Biblical Dogmatics." Philippi with his re-stated old Lutheran dogmatics was but a young professor. Martensen, Thomasius, Kahnis, von Zetzschwitz, von Hofmann, Frank and Luthardt were but students or at least were not yet playing the role of leaders. In fact there were not half a dozen thoroughly confessional Lutheran theologians in all Germany. Yet the tendency of the renewed church life was "decidedly toward the period of the Reformation, the palmy days of the Church, and aimed from thence to invigorate itself and to construct *de novo* a mighty edifice."† Many pastors who lacked the necessary equipment for a thorough investigation of the Old Theology were anxious to become better acquainted with it. Schmid wrote his book to satisfy this want, *i. e.*, to help combat Rationalism and the Tübingen theology, and to direct the strong conservative trend in theology toward confessional Lutheranism and away from Positive Union.

It was the child of the times in which it was written. Conservative theology, especially among the clergy, was seeking the old moorings. It recognized in the systems of the 16th

*Condensed from Frank's "Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie," p. 213, where it is quoted.

†Quoted by C. P. Krauth, Sr., *Evang. Review*, vol. I., from review of book in *Zeitschrift fuer Protestantismus und Kirche*, vol. IX., p. 160.

and 17th centuries the doctrinal inheritance of the Church, yet in receiving that inheritance it felt the freedom of a child. There is no proof whatever that Schmid regarded his book in any other light than that of a means to an end, and that end was the building up of a new confessional Lutheran theology. Yet before the second edition appeared, three and a half years after the first edition, it was claimed by some that Schmid by this compilation from the teachings of the fathers aimed at a mere re-statement of the Old Theology, to the end that this re-stated Old Theology should satisfy all the needs of his time. Concerning the inaccuracy of this assertion and the real purpose of the book as well as his attitude to the Old Theology, we will let the author himself speak: "If, on the other hand, I have in certain quarters been so misunderstood, as though it were my opinion that all that is needed to meet the wants of the present day is the immediate adoption of this Old Theology, I may be allowed to stifle my regret that such an opinion should have been entertained rather than to refute it at length. This misunderstanding cannot have sprung from my own statements, for these express nothing more than a profession of adherence to the doctrines of our Church, and of respect for the intellectual effort displayed in the Old Theology. He who adopts the confession of his Church, however, does not thereby sanction the form of the theological system in which these doctrines are scientifically developed and displayed. If I have therefore not given occasion to this misunderstanding by my own remarks, neither will I be responsible for it. What I have there said [in another publication referred to] will suffice to show that, although I highly esteem, I do not overestimate the old Dogmatists, with whom I have been engaged, much less suppose that, in consequence of their labors, all further efforts are unnecessary."* Schmid recognized the fact that the times had changed and that new questions confronted the theologians of his day. His purpose was to place the foundation stone and not the cap stone of the theological structure. "Although en-

*Preface to the second German edition found in our second English edition.

tirely different and much larger demands must at the present time be made upon a system of divinity, surely no judicious divine will deny that a most direct reference must be had, in every such system, to the old theology."*

As such the work is purely objective and historical. It is not a work of the 19th century, but a compilation from the works of the theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries made in this century. The contents of the book are too frequently estimated from the title as it is found on the back, and not from that which is found on the title-page of the English edition. And yet the one great characteristic feature of the book is not hinted at on the outside. It is the "verified from the original sources" that tell us what the book really is. The German title is, "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt," which C. P. Krauth, Sr., translates, "The Dogmatik of the Evan. Lutheran Church Exhibited and Authenticated by References to the Sources." That pure objectivity was the author's purpose is plainly shown by his preface to the second German edition. From it we gather that he considered his book the "republishing of the Old Theology in all its essential features faithfully and somewhat in extenso," and that it was intended "to spread the materials before the reader as completely as possible for his own use."

The reception that awaited the book was just such as was to be expected under the circumstances. The leaders of the destructive schools, no doubt, saw in it the relics of an out-lived system. Many of the Positive Union men condemned it. But there was a vast number who saw and felt the need of just such a work, and among those it was well received. The conservative journals reviewed it favorably and in the short time of three and one half years a second edition was required. In thirty-three years it passed through six editions, and after the author's death, Frank put out a seventh edition in 1893, which proves that the greatest of all the leaders of German confessional Lutheranism of the last twenty-five years thought the

*Ibid.

book had some service to render in the closing decade of this century.

The present estimate in which the book is held by the conservative theologians of Germany can be got from the following extracts from letters from professors representing four of the most conservative universities of Germany. No question whatever can be raised as to the confessional standing of Næsgen of Rostock and Cremer and Zöckler of Greifswald. Kæstlin belongs to the Prussian Union, yet it seems that nobody thought this interfered with his giving a satisfactory presentation of the theology of Luther. Seeberg also belongs to the Prussian Union, having gone to Berlin a year and a half ago. But while he was at Erlangen he was regarded as a worthy successor of Frank, and since then he was chosen to add a chapter on Frank's theology to Frank's *Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie*." Kirn of Leipzig was called a "good conservative Lutheran" by Luthardt who suggested him as his own successor. The letters were replies to letters of inquiry in which it was stated that the answers to the questions asked would be published. No other professors were inquired of.

Kæstlin of Halle:—"Schmid's book is thus far the best short representation of the doctrines of our old orthodox dogmaticians up to the beginning of the 18th century, and as such should most certainly be recommended to our students of theology. But it affords no introduction whatever to the most important questions that, since then, have arisen for evangelical theology,—such as: Whether those dogmaticians along with the genuinely biblical and especially Reformational doctrine of salvation did not really, without sufficient criticism, adopt much from the forms of doctrine handed down through the Church? Whether or not they paid sufficient attention to the original biblical declarations? And whether they were just to students in other branches in their relation to the religious biblical truth? In order to be able to pass judgment here a knowledge of the more modern theology, both of the positive and negative tendencies, is necessary."

Zöckler of Greifswald: "The Lutheran Dogmatik of Schmid

is without doubt a very useful book, which I also generally recommend to the students and candidates when they seek a knowledge of the older Lutheran dogmatic traditions up to the 18th century. But it must be supplemented in reference to the most modern dogmatic developments since the time of the Pietists."

Kirn of Leipzig: "Schmid's Dogmatik of the Lutheran Church is still extensively used by us. I am accustomed to recommend the book to my students most emphatically and sometimes use it as the basis for the exercises in my dogmatic seminar. * * * I am also of the opinion that the student dare not restrict himself to the mere knowledge of the orthodox system, for which, it is true, Schmid's book offers the best introduction."

Cremer of Greifswald: "Schmid's Dogmatik of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is a good compilation from the old Lutheran dogmaticians as far as Hollazius, and is useful for those to whom the old dogmaticians are inaccessible, but nothing more. From one individual old dogmatician we get a much clearer knowledge of their method than from the work of Schmid. From this one learns only the dogmas for which they contended. And this is because the book is a compilation, and not only that, but is a compilation from many other compilations. * * * As historical presentations Schmid and Hase have their individual advantages, and they can render good service only when used as historical presentations."

Seeberg of Berlin: "In reference to Schmid's Dogmatik I would say that so far as I know it is not used as a text-book in any German university. Schmid gives a brief and precise view of the doctrines of the dogmaticians of the 17th century, but nothing more. Naturally in the course of the last century a number of new problems and questions have arisen for which the student finds no solution in Schmid. Therefore, as much as it is to be prized as an historical source, we can by no means use it as a dogmatic text-book."

Næsgen of Rostock: "In reply to your favor concerning
VOL. XXX. No. 2. 32

Schmid's Dogmatik I would say that the book as an independent treatise is not particularly esteemed by any one. It is only a true but ever dry and not convincing report on the dogmatic statements of the 17th century. For even concerning the impelling motive for the arrangement of the different *loci* we receive no information from it, and it is just this that prevents a knowledge of the full worth of the old dogmaticians. But he who wishes to learn to know this and does not care to study Baier, Gerhard, Hollazius and Quenstedt, can do best by studying Schmid."

Luthardt's estimate of the book can, to a certain extent, be inferred from the following facts. In his *Kompendium* the book is merely mentioned as belonging to the first rank of a class of books that aimed at a return to the doctrines of the Church. In the winter Semester of 1895 and 1896, during which Luthardt was compelled to give up lecturing at the university, he gave his students a regular bibliography of doctrinal theology, but neither do the notes taken by Rev. F. H. Knubel, nor those that I myself wrote, mention Schmid's book. If any mention at all was made of the work it was probably so casual that we did not think it worth noting down, and I myself remember nothing of it. During this semester and the preceding one Schmid was not used as a text-book, nor in any of the Seminar exercises of the university.

Another significant fact that could scarcely have been the result of mere chance came to my attention in Erlangen. A student of apparently fair ability and attainments who had studied theology more than three years, two of which he had spent at Erlangen, astonished me by saying that he knew nothing at all about the book, and when shown the title in a catalogue, he merely remembered that he had seen or heard of it at some time or other. However he knew of Schmid and had used certain of his historical works. This student had already passed his first examination.

It will be seen from these statements that most of the leaders of confessional Lutheranism in Germany to-day believe that the book in question can perform a service which, though import-

ant, is limited by the demands of this age. As an historic introduction to conservative doctrinal theology it stands high, but these professors are very careful to state that it is merely an historic introduction and nothing more, and that it is therefore wholly inadequate to meet the needs of our times. Other problems have arisen than those that confronted the old dogmaticians and they cannot be answered with the dogmatic thought and forms of a past century. It is plain that these criticisms are in perfect harmony with Schmid's own estimation of his book, as shown above.

It is also apparent that the use of the book in German universities is not very extensive. The only use that is reported is in connection with the Seminar exercises. Meusel's "Kirchliches Handlexikon," a very conservative publication just appearing, places it third, having put Luthardt's *Kompendium* and Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus* before it in popularity. Even in Erlangen, where Schmid labored, which is one of the three most conservative universities in all Germany, it is possible for a student to stay and pass his first examination without using the book in any way, in fact with barely knowing the title. To express the estimate of the conservative German professors briefly: the book is not at all widely used, and where it is used, it serves merely as an historic introduction, an easy avenue of approach to the Old Theology, which was Schmid's original and expressed purpose.

When it was first translated into English, and for that matter even now, Lutheran theological literature was very scarce. In fact Martensen's work on dogmatics was about the only good authority we had. The Church, laity, clergy and even theological professors, had been anglicized more rapidly than its theology had been translated. And when the agitation concerning this book that had been going on for about thirty years (probably begun by C. P. Krauth, Sr.,) at last resulted in the translation of the entire work by Drs. Hay and Jacobs, many regarded it as a God-send, thinking that at last they had a means of finding out what true Lutheranism means. The doctrinal excitement incident to the formation of the General Council and its assumption of its confessional attitude also helped to prepare a

heartily welcome for any Lutheran literature that might be published in English. The natural result was that the book soon exercised a considerable influence. It was introduced as a text-book into a number of theological seminaries. When anybody not acquainted with German or Latin wanted to look up anything they were simply compelled to consult Schmid. They had no other authority and had scarcely any means of informing themselves thoroughly about other authorities. Necessity made the work a sort of dictionary of theological quotations systematically arranged, from which many drew, and are now drawing their proof passages when preparing doctrinal articles or discussions for the floor of synod. And now, partly because of language, and perhaps partly because of neglect and prejudice against the new confessional theology of Germany, Schmid's compilation from the works of the fathers is by many regarded as a final court of appeal in all things doctrinal. And no doubt Drs. Hay and Jacobs contributed to this end by asserting in their translators' preface to the second English edition that this book can justly claim to be *facile princeps* in the field of theological science of the Lutheran Church.

A striking contrast forces itself upon us here. Our conservative German brethren, who probably outnumber and certainly outshine us, regard the book in quite another and a different light from that in which we regard it. They accord it an important use for a limited purpose, namely, to furnish a convenient presentation of the Old Theology and nothing more. We allow it to exert a most important, if not the chief influence, in moulding our theological thought. In some places it is deemed a fit text-book for theological students. Yet its original and only purpose, as stated by the author and shown above, was to give a foundation for further thought, and not to give form and content to our thinking of to-day.

The conclusion that forces itself upon us here is that one or the other must be wrong. Either the conservative theologians of Germany underestimate the book, or we overestimate it. They insist that it can perform no other service than to offer a convenient way for studying the Old Theology, *i. e.*, we can

gather from it merely one element of a theological education, which, though very important, is nevertheless only one of several elements that constitute a well rounded theological training. On the other hand we give the work a much more important and influential position, and in using it seem to forget that it is the Old Theology of the 17th century, and not the new Lutheran theology of Thomasius, Frank and Luthardt. The conclusion that we cannot escape is, that they use the book as the author intended it should be used, and that in so far as we do not use it in that way we defeat his purpose and thereby really abuse the book. The writer has never seen anything that even hinted that Schmid regarded his book as a doctrinal plumb-line for testing Lutheranism. It is not a final court of appeal for deciding what Lutheranism is. It merely answers the question as to what Lutheranism was. The good and wise men of several hundred years ago, by solving the great problems of their day, did not furnish answers for all the questions their theological successors would be called upon to consider. And to accord them any such authority is to claim that they exercised a sort of infallibility.

The question of the hour is this: Shall we, ignoring all German developments of recent years, accept *in toto* the 17th century dogmatics as the purest and best type of Lutheranism and compel it to give 17th century answers to 19th century problems? (If so, let us be consistent and go to Missouri at once). Or shall we, ignoring the work of our brethren of our own generation of the land of Luther, accept this Old Theology, and on it as a basis develop independently an American type of Lutheranism? Or shall we, with our brethren, use this priceless inheritance as a foundation on which to build, appropriating, of course with a critical eye, the truth which they won in this century's conflicts, and thus in fact make ourselves the heirs of all the ages, of the present as well as of the past?

ARTICLE VIII.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF JESUS.

BY REV. JOHN TOMLINSON, A. M.

There are three inexplicable things, namely: (1.) The existence of the material universe. (2.) The introduction of man into this world. (3.) The character of Jesus. The development of Jesus was physical, mental and moral. The intellect was not educated at the expense of the moral powers. The will, conscience, heart and reason, all need development and improvement as well as the intellectual faculties. "It is difficult to predict what the result of our present method of education will be in fifty years. We are training the mind in our public schools, but the moral side in the child's nature is almost entirely neglected. The Roman Catholic Church insists on remedying this manifest evil, but our Protestant Churches seem to ignore it completely. They expect the Sunday School to make good what our public schools have undone, and the consequence is that we overlook a danger as real and as great as any we have to face. Our present generation has received an entirely different moral and religious training; the fruits of our present method will appear later." The character of Jesus was symmetrical and this was its beauty. In the discussion of his moral character many things claim attention, namely,

1. His reverence. This is the spirit of worship. Jesus regarded with reverence the names, titles, character and word of God. He honored and respected the ordinances of religion, and revered the Sabbath and the sanctuary. This solemn emotion is the foundation of all religion and moral order. Jesus not only admired God, but he loved him. When he was only twelve years old he accompanied his parents to Jerusalem to attend the Passover. When he arrived in the city he did not go to a tavern or bar-room to play and spree as the prodigal did and too many do to-day, but he went right to the temple or synagogue.

He did not creep behind the door or a pillar, or away from the pulpit to sleep, but right up among the teachers and talked with them about the chief points in Christian doctrine, the corruption of human nature and its improvement through the Messiah, and the nature and design of the Passover. He was thus engaged not only for one or two hours, but for several days. He was so delighted in his Father's house that he could not refrain from saying: I *must* be about my Father's business. His love to God was ardent. His prayers were fervent and his estimation of God's word and day inexpressible.

2. His impeccability. We speak of the human, not of the divine nature of the Saviour, of him in his humiliation. Jesus never committed an actual sin. Peter says: He did no sin, 2. Ep. 2: 22. Neither was he guilty of original sin. Paul says, 2. Cor. 5: 21., he knew no sin, he felt none. When he was tempted, Mt. 4: 1-12, he did not sin. He could not sin. He was exempt from the possibility of sin. Fresenius.

He had to be without sin. He had to fulfill the whole law both as to duty and penalty. He had to suffer the punishment of our sins that he might reconcile us to God by a perfect sacrifice, which might avail to all eternity. He has become our *new* head by whom we obtain power to live a holy life. Our standing in the second Adam is not as slippery as in the first. He was to be a perfect pattern of holiness for us to follow. Baumgarten says: He sinned not by omission nor commission, nor was he possibly a sinner, because of the union of the human and divine natures. The sinlessness of Jesus is to be regarded as a consequence of the fact that he was born without moral pollution. He could not yield to temptation. He was the God-Man. The temptation was one of the Saviour's great humiliations. He was tempted for our benefit, that we might be strengthened and comforted in trial. He was a perfect example.

3. His patience. The wiser a man is the more patience he will have. Jesus knew the nature and design of his sufferings. He had an unwavering confidence in his Heavenly Father and acquiesced fully in his will. And, hence, could bear offences and injuries without murmuring and complaining. His gestures,

words and works were all proofs of his patience. It was voluntary, heroic, constant and universal. In life and death he was characterized by marvelous perseverance. He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so he opened not his mouth. Never was language more descriptive of the most perfect patience—patient as a lamb he stood before his murderers. Even at that dreadful moment when they were nailing him to the cross, when nature whose voice at such a time will be heard, was shuddering and convulsed in the prospect of a speedy and violent death—when his soul was tortured by the assaults of malignant foes and his Father's face hidden from view; even then he possessed his soul in patience to such a degree as to be able to pray for his murderers. The patient sufferer stood with hands fast bound in the midst of his enemies; sinking under the weight of his cross, and lacerated in every part by the thorny rods with which he had been scourged. The savage ferocious soldiers seized with rude violence his sacred body, forcing it down upon the cross, wresting and extending his limbs and with remorseless cruelty, forcing through his hands and feet the ragged spikes which were to fasten him on it, and crucified him. Jewish priests and rulers watch with looks of malicious pleasure the horrid scene and attempt to increase his sufferings by scoffs and horrid blasphemies. Contemplate attentively the countenance of the wonderful Sufferer, which seems like heaven opening in the midst of hell. And what does it express? It is indeed full of anguish, but it expresses nothing like impatience, resentment and revenge, on the contrary, it beams with pity, benevolence and forgiveness. It corresponds perfectly with the prayer, which, raising his mild imploring eye to heaven, he pours forth to God, saying: Father forgive them, for they know not what they do. This prayer is still instinct with heavenly love and power. Well might St. Paul say: Look unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

4. His humility. Paul says: Christ Jesus who being in the

form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. The humility of Jesus was voluntary and sincere. He was not ashamed of the poor and lowly. Born of a poor virgin, the son of a carpenter, he was lowly in spirit. He allowed John the Baptist to baptize him. He associated with publicans and sinners. He washed the feet of his disciples. He willingly suffered all sorts of scorn and contempt. He was numbered among the transgressors. He died between two malefactors as though he were the worst of the three. Surely the way to greatness is through humble service and suffering.

5. His meekness. Meekness is the heart of Jesus. Meekness is a backwardness to provoke others and a backwardness to be provoked by them. The meekness of Jesus was hearty, sincere and impartial. Some are meek toward the strong, but cross to the weak,—meek to friends but savage to enemies. Jesus exhibited this good spirit toward friends and foes. He endured all sorts of injustice. He not only suffered but forgave, died and rose from the dead that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem. He rendered good for evil. He allowed Judas to eat with him though he knew he had a devil from the beginning. In his threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King, he was meek. The prophet says: He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard on the street. He came not to destroy men's lives but to save them. Hence he himself says: Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in spirit and ye shall find rest for your souls. Well might the great apostle say: I, Paul, myself, beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. Pertinently did the Psalmist say: His name shall endure forever. His name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him blessed.

6. His sympathy. Jesus wept at the grave of Lazarus. He wept over the city of Jerusalem, saying: O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!

As he died for all, so he felt and wept for the sufferings of all. The temporal and eternal calamities of the whole human race, and of every individual among them, all seemed to be collected and laid upon him. He saw at one view the whole mighty aggregate of human guilt and human wretchedness; and his boundless benovelence and compassion made it, by sympathy, all his own. It has been said by philosophers that if any man could see all the misery which is daily felt in the world he would never smile again. No wonder then that Jesus, who saw and felt it all, never smiled, though he often wept.

7. His self-denial. All self-denial is choosing. It is choosing a better thing instead of a poorer one. It is the victory of the superior over the inferior man. In a man that is a Christian the rational triumphs over the animal. It is Gabriel with the dragon underneath that represents self-denial. The dragon has gone under; it is with a great deal of squirming often, but he has gone under, and the angel is on top. Jesus is the most illustrious example of self-denial on record. He being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. In regard to his poverty, he himself said: The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head. Well might St. Paul say to the Corinthians: Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. He became poor in the circumstances of his birth; poor in the circumstances of his life, and poor in the circumstances of his death, that we might be rich in grace and

glory. He sacrificed himself for the redemption of sinful and lost men. What a wonderful Saviour!

8. His benevolence. Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them. Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. He did good both to the bodies and souls of men. He healed the centurion's servant and the nobleman's son. He healed Peter's wife's mother and the impotent man. He healed the paralytic and forgave him his sins. He restored to sight the blind and cured the deaf and dumb. He cured the dropsy and healed many and divers diseases. He was a benediction to the human race.

9. His zeal. Zeal is the ardor of all the affections, carrying forth a man to the utmost for God's glory and his Church's good. It is not so much an affection as an intense degree of all the affections. The zeal of Jesus ate him up as fire eats up and devours that whereon it lights. The Saviour's zeal ate him up; he forgot everything else, except the glory of God, the honor of his house and the purity of his worship. What was said of Peter, that he was a man made up of all fire; and of St. Paul, in respect of his sufferings, that he was a spark of fire burning in the midst of the sea, may much more truly be said of Jesus, when he was engaged in the work of Church-Reformation, when he was about his Father's work, promoting his glory and propagating his truth. Jesus was zealously affected in every good work. The character of Jesus contains *all* the elements of a noble manhood, but the writer will close his enumeration with

10. His sincerity. No guile was found in his mouth. Jesus spoke what he thought. His heart, mouth and conduct harmonized. He avoided hypocrisy. He praised John the Baptist more when absent than when present. If he had a reprimand to give he did so in presence of the offender and not in his absence. He degraded no man. Wisdom and discretion were combined with his sincerity. He did not confide in *every* man. Many believed in his name when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men; John, 2 : 24. He possessed the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove. In the performance of all his duties both to God and man he was sincere. He never did as Judas did, who betrayed him with a kiss; nor as a clock which strikes one thing and points to another. He never violated truth. What he promised could be depended on. He paid no false compliments to any one; he passed no hypocritical commendations on anybody; he played no tricks on any one. He was sincere both with his friends and foes. He never concealed the truth. His sincerity extended to all duties and virtues, faith, humility, meekness, gentleness, etc.

All men are capable of those excellences. They are moral and human. They consist not in the power, majesty and wisdom of the Deity, but in the voluntary actions of the man Christ Jesus. They have nothing to do with the peculiar constitution of his *person* or the faculties of his divine nature, but all men are commanded to possess and cultivate them. 1 John 2 : 6. We become like Jesus (1.) By meditating on his life and character. (2.) By remembering his commandments. (3.) By receiving the Holy Supper often, and (4) By imitating his excellent example. This can only be done by the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion, the end of all education is character. If the result of education be not good character, it is defective. That education which neglects or ignores the moral side of the child, or scholar *is* deficient. Nothing is more important than character. Character will go along into the eternal world. Kindred, money and treasure must be left behind, but character will go

with us into the future life. If it meets the approval of God a gracious reward will follow in heaven: if not a deserved reward in hell, will be the result. Evermore should the character of Jesus be exalted. It is perfect, a model for all time. The man Christ Jesus *must* be alike the root and stalk, blossom and fruit of character that God can approve and crown with honor and glory forever in heaven.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY PROF. DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

The higher critics of the liberalistic school have had the field for some time. They have produced on the lines of the new views a vast amount of literature. Their industry has been something amazing, and has served to commend them to such as cannot share their views or accord a welcome to their numerous hypotheses. It is now becoming manifest that the conservatives, as was the case in the Tuebingen attacks upon the validity of the New Testament writings fifty years ago, have not been idle, and the results of their studies are now beginning to appear in book after book, such as Prof. Green's "Introduction," and in the periodical literature of the churches. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for January contains three articles by as many pronounced conservative scholars of high standing, and aggregating one hundred and six pages of that publication.

1. The first of these able and timely articles is by the venerable Prof. William P. Dickson, of Scotland. It is an exhaustive and thorough review of Prof. McGiffert's "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." It is a thorough and detailed examination of Prof. McGiffert's historical methods. In an article covering fifty-four pages he shows, as it seems to us, beyond dispute, the groundless hypotheses and utterly fallacious historical methods of the much discussed Union Seminary Professor.

Something of the character of Dr. Dickson's searching criticism is given in the conclusion of his article, which we here quote:

"When one looks to the period and the matters handled by Dr. McGiffert, which, in the judgment at least of the Church, have special significance and unique importance, there seems grave reason to take exception to the use of the term 'History' *pure and simple* as covering the wider field which his book embraces. If it presents to us history, we find it in such close association with the writer's own contributions of critical conjecture and speculative guesswork as to seem to the ordinary reader almost inseparably bound up with them. Although the work is not formally called a text-book, its inclusion in the 'International Theological Library' obviously points to its having that character and purpose. If so, why should a poor student entering on his course, or a simple layman in quest of the generally recognized facts, be subjected to the necessity of *disengaging* the 'history' from the matter with which it is mixed up, or, alternatively of accepting, on Dr. McGiffert's authority, much that subsequent inquiry may discover to be gratuitously superinduced, mistaken and misleading? Why should the title not have conveyed some intimation—some note of warning—as to the distinctive *two-fold* character of the book? How much misconception would have been obviated, had Dr. McGiffert designated his book after a manner more truly and fully descriptive of its contents, *e. g.*, 'The history of Christianity in the apostolic age as it has now been conjecturally discovered and reconstructed in accordance with the writer's own canons of judgment?'"

2. The second of these articles is by the accomplished Baptist scholar, Dr. Howard Osgood, whose attainments as a biblical scholar place him in the front rank of such in our day. The title of his contribution to the subject of old Testament study is 'The unerring witness to the Scriptures.' It is an appeal to the Divine Word itself as witnessed to in Christian experience. The gist of Dr. Osgood's article is given in the following:

"Those who thus would renounce the Old Testament and keep

the New are little acquainted with the anti-Biblical writers of all ages, from Porphyry and Celsus to Voltaire and Paine, Kuenen and Wellhausen. Those writers prove to their own satisfaction, with the concurrence of some professed Christians, but against the whole life and testimony of Christ, that the Old Testament is on a low moral plane, and then by precisely parallel reasoning and similar instances they range the New Testament alongside of the Old, and the depreciators of the Old Testament, who would retain the New, are caught in their own pit. The very learned deistical and infidel writers would drive us just where they want us; either the Bible is God's word or it is a fraud. They believe it is a fraud. We know by the experience of our sin, by the experience of salvation by Christ, by a daily life with the Bible, that it is God's word. That is the clearest, deepest, firmest knowledge possible to human brain and heart. It is founded on the experience of the conscious reality of God, who cannot lie, and on the testimony, often repeated, of our Saviour.

"Christ's testimony to the Old Testament is God the Father's testimony spoken through Christ, that by these 'two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us.' "

3. The third in this series of fine articles is by Prof. B. B. Warfield of Princeton Seminary and is entitled "God-inspired Scripture." The author has given us in a keen and thorough manner a re-investigation of the meaning of one of the most important words of the Scriptures, viz., *Θεόπνευστος*. The article is a fine example of literary criticism of the best kind and deserves to be widely read by thoughtful students both of theology and the New Testament. He traces first the meaning of this great word in the few passages of post-Christian Greek in which it occurs. St. Paul's is the first instant of its use. It is found in the fifth book of the Sibylline oracles; in a poem which was formerly attributed to Prokylides, but now known to be of later origin; in the Jewish-Christian *Testament of Abraham*; in the paraphrase of John's Gospel by Nonnus, a poet who lived in Egypt in the fifth century; and of course in the Church

Fathers. In most of these cases the passive sense of the word is certain, and in the others the writer easily proves it. Two instances are brought forward in works attributed to Plutarch and Galen, but really of later origin. Here the passive sense is evident; but Cremer and other scholars contend that the true reading was another word meaning "God-sent." Prof. W. enters into a fine piece of tectual argumentation, which makes it at least probable that the non-Christian writers used "*theopneustos*" and if so, certainly used it in the passive sense.

In the rest of his article Prof. Warfeld shows that the conception of the Scriptures as "God-breathed" or divinely originated is one in perfect accordance with Hebrew methods of thought and figures of speech, and that it was the prevailing conception both in Jewish and early Christian circles. He states an important truth which believers in the Bible should not forget, when he writes: "Through whatever minor differences may be traceable between the general New Testament conception and treatment of Scripture and that of Philo, it remains a plain matter of fact that no other general view of Scripture than the so-called Philonian is discernable in the New Testament, all of whose writers—as is true of Jesus himself also, according to his reported words—consistently look upon the written words of Scripture as the express utterances of God, owing their origin to his direct spiration and their character to this their divine origin." That is what St. Paul meant by *theopneustos*.

The most noteworthy article in the January number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, is that by Prof. Hugh Scott, D. D., of the Chicago Congregational Seminary. Prof. Scott, it may be recalled by some of our readers, gave the Stone lectures at Princeton Seminary in 1896, under the title, "The Nicene Theology," a book of much value and strength, in which the author shows his close attention as a student to the writings of Thomasius and other Lutheran dogmaticians. He is a pronounced conservative and Calvinist. This article ought to serve as an antidote for that large amount of specious theological speech in our times, that has been associated with the alleged superiority of right

conduct to right belief. We have been assured many times that among other things that will mark the emancipated Church of the future there will be a discarding of doctrine and a making of conduct the all and in all. Upon the man who still maintains anything like a vigorous robustness in his religious beliefs, the latitudinarian now empties his critical Pandora's box and consigns his teachings to the literary and theological limbo by valiantly asserting—"That is mere intellectualism, mere dogmatism." Of course all this is fallacious talk. Prof. Scott's article is an exhaustive examination of the bearings of the Ritschlian theology, now so widely current in Germany and popularized in this country, on personal piety and Christian work. It is made manifest that the weight of proof, adjudged by our Lord's own test of "By their fruits ye shall know them," is decidedly on the side of definiteness in men's religious beliefs. We regret that we can quote but a few excerpts from this timely and strong article.

"The mediating men, who press the immanence of God towards pantheistic positions, *cripple personal religion in at least four directions*. By their impersonal view of God they chill the prayer of petition and thanksgiving. By confusing the personality of God and man, they confuse our hopes of personal immortality, and diminish the encouragements and rewards held out to virtuous living. By making good and evil but different degrees in the development of the one Divine Principle, they blunt our moral sense, and put a kind of passive resignation in place of an active religious life. And by making all human acts part of a divine movement, they deaden man's feeling of responsibility and guilt. 'It claims for all men what Christianity claims for its own elect.'

"In the use of the Church and sacraments, there is only one respect in which the new theology seems to make them of equal value for the religious life with the older teachings; that is, in the great importance ascribed by the school of Ritschl to the Church as the birthplace of the believer. Many beautiful things are said of this home of the soul on earth. But when we inquire how the Church aids men to faith and holy living,

we are met by a cloud of generalities. The Church is made to take the place of the *unio mystica*; and those who grow up within her pale, in a mysterious way become Christians. Instead of personal communion with God in the Church, we are offered a religious 'atmosphere.' Instead of personal conversion in the Church we receive an "impression" of Christ. The devotional meetings which have marked the life of the Church from the apostles down, are denounced as unchristian, and the Church is described as a moral kingdom on the earth. * * *

"It follows, naturally enough, that the devotion, the worship, of such Christianity, will have nothing emotional in it; emotional religion is Pietism or Methodism, and this school has such horror of the 'mystic piety' of these movements that it allows only man's intellect and will to engage in the worship of Almighty God. Confession of sin is little heard of, and there are few requests for particular things, the doctrine of Divine Providence being urged so as to leave not much room for prayer. God loves us all, and can do all things; he will care for us without our telling him what we want. There is little heard, also, in this devotion, of sanctification; I find no reference to the Holy Ghost in Herrmann's book on 'Communion with God.' And, as we have observed already, such things as revivals, prayer-meetings, testifying for Christ, and what we call personal work, are all opposed. The chief defect of this new theology of Divine Providence is that it understands by providence only God's natural government of the universe, his blessings upon the evil and the good, rather than any special care of the righteous. No distinction is made between God as Spirit and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter; hence the testimonium Spiritus Sancti, taking the things of Christ and revealing them to personal experience, and many other tender, special, even supernatural inbreathings of this "mother" manifestation of God, are put out of the place of prayer. The Holy Ghost Kaftan calls 'the working of God in the world,' also the 'principle of a morally new life'; but it is not personal. * * *

"But when we draw nearer to this theology, the shadows cast by its general excellences are so deep that we can scarcely find

the way to our particular duty. We are met everywhere by an indefiniteness like unto that of the radical theologians. Eike, the last and most praised historian of this movement, points out in detail how it is everywhere pervaded by lack of immediateness; of direct relation to God or Christ or moral ideals. And such generalities are the death of prayer and devotion. Herrmann and Kaftan and Harnack, and other disciples of Ritschl in both Europe and America, declare that out of their religious experience certain doctrines of faith have arisen, and that they have the indirect character complained of. But the query at once is suggested, How does it happen that the experience of a thousand times as many other Christians produces doctrines of faith, that prove themselves by their works, which are of a much more direct nature? And how does it happen that these indirect views of doctrine are so similiar to those which arose in the experience of Ritschl himself? Nay, further, how does it happen that doctrines of faith appear in the experience of these disciples bearing a stamp put upon them, not by the faith and religious experience of Ritschl, but by his natural temperament as a man?

One of the high class religious publications of the world is the *Church Quarterly Review*, published in London. It is devoted exclusively to literary reviews of important theological publications, many of which are elaborate treatises on the subjects involved in the publication under review. The work of this *Quarterly* is uniformly of high literary excellence. The January number contains two such treatises from which we desire to make extracts. During the year 1899, Professor Gardner, Literary Doctor, has published what the *Quarterly* calls a "startling book," under the title, "A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief." Prof. Gardner has announced his purpose as primarily being neither "constructive" nor "destructive," but rather, "critical." He has tried to present not an "exposition of a ready made creed," or an "attempt to fix some new scheme of doctrine" but "an *exploratio*, a psychologic and historic investigation of the origins of Christianity, partly with a

view to the possibilities of belief among the new surroundings of our times."

Even this Literary Doctor, however, has been obliged to acknowledge that his work is sometimes decidedly "destructive" in its character. The result of his criticism of Christianity would mean unquestionably the destruction of that religion which is the inheritance of the Christian Church.

As an indication of the tendency and end of the new views now widely current in religion, we may quote the conclusion of the *Quarterly Review's* timely criticism:

"It is not perhaps altogether loss that he has plainly expressed unpleasant views which many are content to hide in their minds, and has shown the real tendencies of lines of thought some advocates of which would shrink from the conclusions which he has reached. Yet in summing up our judgment, we must pronounce the book a failure. It is based to a very large extent, as we have already briefly mentioned, on the dualistic Kantian philosophy, which is surely doomed. The author is fundamentally wrong, as we have spent some time in trying to show, as to the need of facts in theology, the place of the New Testament in the Christian system, and the critical methods adopted. His view of religion is, we are firmly convinced, practically useless. It may in some measure avail subjectively for a select intellectual few, while what is needed, and what orthodox Christianity supplies, is a religion for mankind. For any person at all, the substitution of it for the Catholic faith must mean serious loss in the trials of ordinary life, in times of temptation, and in the hour of death. For it blots out all which is most practically helpful to Christian souls. To give one illustration: those who accept it must remove from their prayers all which corresponds to two clauses of the Litany:

"By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation; by Thy holy Nativity and Circumcision; by Thy Baptism, Fasting and Temptation,

Good Lord, deliver us.

"By Thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial; by thy glorious

Resurrection and Ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost,

Good Lord, deliver us.

"We do not doubt Professor Gardner's sincerity when he says he has not written for those who are still content with traditional Christianity, but only for those 'who regard dogmatic religion in our days as in an unsafe condition.'"

The last volume of the Bampton lectures, that for 1899, is on the delightful subject of "Christian Mysticism" by W. R. Inge of Hertford College, Oxford. The *Church Quarterly Review* pronounces this one of the two most valuable books published during the last twelve months. Mr. Inge's book is decidedly fascinating. We have the book itself together with the review of it here before us. It is a thorough piece of work, well thought out and executed. In the following passages from the peroration of his book, Mr. Inge defines his position as to Christian Mysticism.

"The constructive task which lies before the next century is, if I may say so without presumption, to spiritualize science, as morality and art have already been spiritualized. The vision of God should appear to us as a triple star of truth, beauty and goodness. These are the three objects of all human aspiration; and our hearts will never be at peace till all three alike rest in God. Beauty is the chief mediator between the good and the true; and this is why the great poets have been also prophets. Science at present lags behind; she has not found her God; and to this is largely due the 'unrest of the age.' Much has already been done in the right direction by divines, philosophers, and physicists, and more still, perhaps, by the great poets, who have striven earnestly to see the spiritual back-ground which lies behind the abstractions of materialistic science. * * *

In St. John and St. Paul we find all the principles of a sound and sober mysticism; and it is to these 'fresh springs' of spiritual life that we must turn, if the Church is to renew her youth. *

* * The principle 'Cuique in sua arte credendum est' applies to those who have been eminent for personal holiness as

much as to the leaders in any other branch of excellence *

* * Now it will be found that these men of acknowledged and pre-eminent saintliness agree very closely in what they tell us about God. They tell us that they have arrived gradually at an unshakable conviction, not based on inference, but on immediate experience, that God is a Spirit with whom the human spirit can hold intercourse; that in him meet all that they can imagine of goodness, truth, and beauty; that they can see His foot-prints everywhere in nature, and feel his presence within them as the very life of their life, so that in proportion as they come to themselves they come to him. They tell us that what separates us from him and from happiness is, first, self-seeking in all its forms; and secondly, sensuality in all its forms; that these are the ways of darkness and death, which hide us from the face of God; while the path of the just is like a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. *

* * It is not claimed that Mysticism, even in its widest sense, is, or ever can be, the whole of Christianity. Every religion must have an institutional as well as a mystical element.

* * * Still, at the present time, the greatest need seems to be that we should return to the fundamentals of spiritual religion. We can not shut our eyes to the fact that both the old seats of authority, the infallible Church and the infallible Book, are fiercely assailed, and that our faith needs reinforcements. These can only come from the depths of the religious consciousness itself; and if summoned from thence, they will not be found wanting. The 'impregnable rock' is neither an institution nor a book, but a life of experience."

II.

GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

Prof. Seeberg of Berlin wrote two articles in the Jan. and Feb. number of the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* under the title, "On the Threshold of the Nineteenth Century." In them he essays to answer the questions, What have we experienced in

the Church of this century? What has been reached? What has happened? His purpose, however, is not to attempt a narration of all the individual events that make up the history of the Christian Church for this century, but rather to give an account of the "inner course" of its history. We find two epochs of church life in this period. The one stands in close relation to the last century and the other has begun a work that cannot come to a relative conclusion before the twentieth century.

1. The inheritance from the last century was the spirit of "enlightenment" which was the "natural right" of the Middle Ages, whose resolving criticism of the existing order of things in Church, state and society had been restrained by the Reformation. Soon after the beginning of the 18th century it forced its way back again into Germany, and with a bit of conjecture, set aside the "pure doctrines" of Orthodoxy, which because of its iron bands was not dear to any one, and which Pietism had made to appear useless, and Rationalism showed that it was contrary to reason and harmful. But these formulas of the masters of "pure doctrine" possessed a tenacity of life that defied all opposition, and in the second third of this century they drove Rationalism from the field on almost every hand, and are working now in the thought of the overwhelming majority of evangelical Christians.

However, "enlightenment" wrought lasting change in a number of things, such as the consciousness of freedom, responsibility of personality, independence in judging the existing order of things, etc. Rousseau, who gave "enlightenment" its best weapons, was finally the one who instructed the generation that in the name of life and feeling trampled the "reasonable thoughts" of "enlightenment" under foot. The change was rapid and sudden on all sides. Really the history of the first half of this century was determined by the continuous striving to throw back the "enlightenment" of the previous century. It was an age of restoration. "Schleiermacher's new theology, Hegel's philosophy, the system of Goethe, and above all Romantic Poetry and the enthusiasm for life and feeling and history, the alliance of Pietism and Orthodoxy—both coming rapidly to

the front, not as opponents but as allies—the political situation and the ecclesiastico-practical tendencies” were the factors that worked together in uprooting the theories of “enlightenment” in order to put in its place strong thoughts on the realities of life and history. “The theology of the 16th century must be taken up again,” just as it is, thought some; as the expression of the idea according to its conception, thought certain others; while still another class thought that it should be “simplified by elimination” and “deepened” by “speculative elements,” “as it were smoothed up new.” But the powers that overcame “enlightenment” did not bring with them the tendency merely to restore the old. They rather let loose new tendencies. The work of restoration was made up of questions rather than of positive formulas. Life and faith stand out again as positive realities. How shall they be formulated in state and Church? The solution of this problem was the work of the second half of the century. Von Hofmann said that “men were seeking new ways to teach old truth.” We can thus characterize the view-points from which we can get an understanding of the course of the development of the Church in this century: “First, the restoration of the old faith over against ‘enlightenment’ and also the appearance of questions concerning the new forms for theology and Church. Second, the striving after new forms for the old faith and the old Church. How we came to these special questions in Church and state and what has been done toward their solution—these are the historical questions that will occupy us in the following pages.”

2. At the beginning of this century Rationalism was on the throne, its best days having been numbered, just as a man does not reach the period of highest recognition until those years which we call his “best” are behind him. It was taught in all the universities. The doctrine of the Trinity, Divinity of Christ, original sin, and redemption through the blood of Christ, were regarded as unreasonable notions, therefore not really meant to be taught in the Bible. They claimed to hold to the teachings of Christ but strove “to free his pure ethical teachings from the Rabbinism of Paul and from the later Platonism and Neo-Plato-

nism." The gospel of Christ was essentially identical with the "religion of reason."

3. But there were still some who held to the doctrines of Christ in the old positive way, country pastors, even a consistorium here and there, and certain university professors. The old sermon books, hymn books and prayer books exerted a great influence. The spirit of Pietism also survived. Christian associations were formed throughout all Germany in which Pietism and Orthodoxy were united against a common foe.

4. Schiller with his "æsthetic religion" and Goethe with his profound sense for the objective and real in contradistinction from the speculative, and Herder and other leaders in the realms of literature and philosophy, also helped the Church in its struggle with Rationalism.

5. In 1799 Schleiermacher published his "Addresses on Religion to the Cultured among its Despisers" which at once caused many important discussions and entered as a ferment into the religious life of the nation. In it he teaches that religion does not consist in knowing or in willing but in feeling. It is an "experience," "a holy instinct," "the feeling of the universal," "the sense of the Eternal." This was something new. A prophet of a deeper faith had arisen. Ten years later he appeared as the reformer of theology, declaring that it was a positive science.

6. Then came the great events of the beginning of the century, the Napoleonic wars, the fall of the old empire, the rise of the national sense, the ruin of the great army, etc. Men felt and knew that God was making history. He was no longer the postulate of the practical reason, but the living Lord. H. Leo wrote: "It was in this time that the worn out clothes of the insipid Rationalism of Germany were torn into rags."

7. But patriotism is no substitute for piety. The great awakening followed in the restoration of the old faith which was felt everywhere.

8. The Catholic Church understood to gather the fruits of the restoration earlier than the Protestant Church. Once priests

formed the Church, but the time demanded laymen who would contend in the literary struggles of the day, and Rome supplied them.

9. Protestant theology was soon occupied with the work of restoration. Claus Harms, who had been influenced by Schleiermacher, published in 1817 his thesis against reason and conscience as the protestant pope of his time, in which he advocated "Old Lutheranism." The effect of this pamphlet can be judged best from the fact that in a very short time there appeared about two hundred replies. In Bavaria the struggle came to an open controversy in 1825. In 1827 Hengstenberg, a young privat-docent of 25, with the active coöperation of many learned men of his day, began a church paper with the avowed purpose of overthrowing Rationalism. Gesenius and Wegschneider of Halle were severely arraigned for their loose interpretations of scripture. Tholuck followed Hegel's parting advice and brought a "pereat" to the "*Rationalismus Vulgaris*" of this institution. Hase of Leipzig in a controversy that lasted three years completely overwhelmed Roehr and finished what Hengstenberg had begun. Rationalism ceased to be the science.

10. In 1817 the Union was established in Prussia for the spiritual welfare of the Church. It was not well received, and force was resorted to in certain instances. At length it changed from a union by absorption to a union by confederation, and thus allowed the genuine development of the individual peculiarities of both confessions.

11. In this period there were a number of phenomena that at the same time marked the downfall of Rationalism and the beginning of a new development. Chief among these was Schleiermacher's "*Glaubenslehre*" (work on dogmatics) of 1821. It was in the broadest sense of the word an epoch-making work which influenced the dogmatic activity of the entire century. He builds his system by taking as his foundation the personal experience of the pious Christian. "From the real powers of the religious life of the Christian congregation we can learn what religion is and what its content."

12. Kant's influence continued. We notice it in Schleiermacher. But he was soon surpassed by Hegel who gave us the thought of development. Everything real is only a passing step in the development of being. Schelling reversed the process and in his speculation went from God to the world.

13. The theologians of the period chose as their master either Schleiermacher (Twisten, DeWette, Bleek et al.) or Hegel (Marheineke, Rosenkranz). Herder influenced exegesis somewhat. Strauss in his "Life of Jesus" 1835 declared that the stories about Jesus were myths. This book brought before the Church problems on which it has been working a long time. In the same year Vatke of Berlin applied the idea of development to the Old Testament religion and taught that the Monotheism of Javehism of the prophets was a slow development from the worship of objects of nature. The book at first exercised no influence.

14. But the restoration of the old faith soon showed a tendency to take up a theology that had given formulas for the expression of the old faith, and it was thought that this theology was to be found in the 17th century orthodoxy; consequently it was expected that academic theologians should reproduce the same. In turning back to the hymns and devotional works of a former age, it was deemed necessary to take up also the old theology with all its questions and problems, forms and formulas. It was as if there had been no 18th century. The theology of the 17th century was regarded as the normal theology which error is plainly expressed in the title of Schmid's so-called dogmatik. And this idea hindered the free development of theological thought. The glorification of the "fathers" of the Church and their theology as a "sacred dome" was "much less of a blessing to the Church than they thought."

15. The old faith was restored, but new questions had arisen. Schleiermacher, Hegel, Strauss, and the old dogmatics, were incentive, but they called forth many very difficult problems. During the first half of the century Baur is the only man who can be compared with Schleiermacher in importance. His service consisted in raising the questions concerning history of

doctrine, the history of primitive Christianity and the genesis of the canon. "Both worked positively and negatively. But with Schleiermacher the positive overcame the negative, but with Baur it was the opposite. From Schleiermacher we learn both questioning and answering, from Baur often only the former. Therefore a great deal remains from Schleiermacher and little remains from Baur. Schleiermacher is still studied, but how many read Baur's books to-day?"

Thus the first half of the century closes with a number of most important questions awaiting solution.*

It is just a little more than one hundred years since the question of "sources" in Acts was first mooted. However its discussion was very limited until after 1886. Several articles have recently appeared reviewing the various publications from that time to the present.

The question is, did the author of Acts use "sources," *i. e.*, other written accounts of the events he narrates? If so, how did he use them and to what extent did he use them? Can they be distinguished? If so, can we by resolving the book into its component parts reconstruct a history of the oldest Jewish congregation and of the anti-Pauline heathen Christianity? The fact that Luke tells us that he used "sources" in writing the third gospel makes it easy to assume that he did the same in writing Acts. "This guess is made probable by the linguistic peculiarities of the book, which, though it has great uniformity as a whole, shows, nevertheless, noteworthy differences in vocabulary and style, and many unevennesses and dark places in composition. This probability is made unimpeachable certainty by the appearance of the so-called "we" sections, which in spite of their close relation to the whole appear in the midst of their surroundings as *membra disjecta*." Even conservative men like Noesgen, Zoeckler, K. Schmidt and Zahn, who stand firmly for the literary unity of the book, admit that these parts prove that there were at least written memoranda, of course by the same author, made

*Remainder of this series of articles in next issue.

some time previously, that were used in writing the book. And if we must assume "sources" for the latter part of Acts we certainly must do the same for the fore part, for in it we find plainer traces of such a method of writing. The question is: Can these "sources" be traced?

Bernhard Weiss, in his *New Testament Introduction*, (1886-'89-'97), brought the question of "sources" into prominence. He teaches that the whole of the second part of Acts is from the pen of Luke and that the irregularities are to be accounted for by assuming that Luke had made notes which he used. For the fore part of the book he assumes a Jewish-Christian written source which was prepared by an eye-witness of the events that he narrates and which can be gotten by eliminating from the text as we have it the additions of the compiler, which parts are easily recognized. Wendt, of Jena, in his editions of Meyer's *Commentary*, that appeared soon after Weiss' work, was not inclined to go so far as Weiss, but in the last edition of this *Commentary* he was much less conservative than had been expected.

Feine, in a magazine article that treats of the first half of Acts, traces a source that was used by Luke in his gospel, and postulates another source for chapters 6 and 7. Sorof attempts to win a solution by supposing that Luke wrote an original account which was re-edited by Timothy, The Hollander, Van-Manen, ventures the hypothesis of a final reduction about 125 or 150 A. D., by some one who used an "Acts of Paul" and an "Acts of Peter," which sources had already had a literary history.

In 1891 Spitta made what is perhaps the most valuable contribution to this literature on the "sources" for Acts. He postulates two "sources" that for the most part are parallel and can be distinguished from each other throughout the book. These "sources" differ widely in value and accuracy. "The one was written by a man who stood near to the early development of Christianity, the other was separated from it by quite a period of time. The one was written by a far-seeing man who handled tradition critically. The author of the other source had implicit confidence in tradition. Consequently the one is a reliable historical work, the other is not. J. Weiss accepts this theory, but

applies it very differently. Clemen supposes that there were reductions by men of different tendencies in their attitude toward Jewish Christianity. Hilgenfeld postulates three sources.

These extreme hypotheses have been strongly, and to a great extent successfully, opposed by Noesgen, Ewald, K. Schmidt, Zoeckler, Blass, Zahn, Felten and Belzer. Yet even Zahn acknowledges that several sources must be assumed for Acts, as well as for the Gospel, but he gives most earnest warning that the attempt at separating these sources should not be carried too far, because none as yet have attained to any considerable degree of probability.

A number of critics have been attacking Zahn for what they call "the majestic silence" of his New Testament Introduction in regard to some of the most important problems connected with the Fourth Gospel. Even among certain conservatives there is apparently a feeling of disappointment and regret that he did not discuss the questions more thoroughly. The one which seems to call forth most objection is that of the seeming disagreement between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, as to the time when Jesus became known to his disciples as the Messiah, the Fourth Gospel placing it right in the beginning, and the Synoptics showing no trace of it, in fact giving evidence of ignorance in regard to it, until quite late in his earthly ministry. Recent notices of the book show that Zahn is perfectly consistent in not discussing the question, because he claims that John, instead of following Jesus from the beginning of his ministry, takes us at once to the zenith of the Galilean activity. Thus Zahn finds no contradiction needing explanation. He accounts for the difference between John's gospel and the other three gospels by regarding the expression as a popular designation for the whole seven days celebration.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ROGER WILLIAMS PRESS, PHILADELPHIA.

Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism. By Augustus Hopkins Strong. President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, author of "Systematic Theology," "Philosophy of Religion," and "The Great Poets and their Theology," 1899.

Dr. Strong here appears in a new role—as an "Ethical Monist." It does not seem to us, however, that in this he appears at his best. The same vigorous thinker, the same richly freighted mind, the same interesting and suggestive writer is here, but there were inherent and insuperable difficulties in the task essayed which have rendered the chief part of the work, that which gives title to the volume, quite unsatisfactory. It is not to the eminent author's discredit that he has not succeeded, as we believe he has not, in proving the speculative cosmical and theological view he has offered.

The title, we believe, is new. The fundamental philosophy, it is certain, is not new. Under various forms Monism has been exploited in the past and has following in the present, but in its basal contention and formal presentation has always been rejected by Christian theology as irreconcilable with Scripture teaching and the interests of religion and morality. But it here comes to us under adaptive metamorphosis, through use of some great Scripture truths and Biblical phraseology, which gives plausibility to the claim of its being a rejection and supersession of all false Monism by a world-view in harmony with the latest and completest understanding of the teaching of revelation as well as the demands of science. The aim of the author is intensely Christian, and no one can fail to sympathize with his earnest desire to overcome men's intellectual difficulties. It deserves a candid consideration. But nothing is gained by new theories which involve more difficulties than belong to the truths under accepted views.

Dr. Strong fully concedes that all the prevalent forms of monism, whether pantheistic or materialistic, are inconsistent with Christian doctrine and the foundations for the moral life. He, therefore, earnestly disclaims pantheistic character for the view which he presents. What then is this new monism? It is fairest to let his own language state it:

"Let me then sum up my monistic doctrine by saying: There is but one substance—God. The eternal Word, whom in his historic manifestation we call Christ, is the only complete and perfect expression of God. The universe is Christ's finite and temporal manifestation of God.

The universe is not itself God—it is only the partial unfolding of God's wisdom and power, adapted to the comprehension of finite intelligences. It has had a beginning—the world is temporal, while the Word is eternal. * * * This is not pantheism, for pantheism is not simply monism, but monism coupled with two denials, the denial of the personality of God and the denial of the transcendence of God. My doctrine takes the grain of truth in pantheism, namely, its monistic element, while it maintains in opposition to pantheism the personality of God and the personality of man, though it regards the latter as related to the former somewhat as the persons of the Trinity are related to the one all-inclusive divine personality. My doctrine maintains the transcendence of God, though it regards this transcendence as not necessarily out-sideness in space, but rather inexhaustibleness of resource within, and so conceives of evolution as the common method of God, while it leaves room for supernatural working in incarnation, resurrection, regeneration."

This "personality" and "transcendence" of God are maintained in the interest of the ethical demand. "Ethical Monism recognizes all the truth there is in pantheism, without including any of its errors. It recognizes the all-inclusive life of the universe, while it adds the truths pantheism ignores—God's personality and transcendence." An Ethical Monist is declared to be "a believer that God and man are of one substance, but a hater of pantheism, which denies God's transcendence and separate personality." A proper conception of this monism, however, can be given only by quoting additional definitive statements. Man is spoken of as "of the substance of God." In harmony with the idea in the above given extract, in connection with reminder of the accepted doctrine that *Christ* is "of the substance of God," with a "distinct personality," we are asked: "If in the one substance of God there are three *infinite* personalities, why may there not be in that same substance multitudinous *finite* personalities?" Human "consubstantiality" with God is distinctly a part of the new view. This, certainly, is a novel extension in Christian theology, of the application of the Nicene term "homousian," "consubstantial." "Depotentiality" into human *finiteness* took place when the race was formed by Christ. "Since he is the only life of humanity, the race began to be, and it continued to be, only by virtue of a kenosis of the Logos." "These finite spirits are circumscriptions of the divine substance." "Nature is the omnipresent Christ, manifesting God to his creatures." Goschel is quoted with approval: "Christ is humanity; we have it; he *is* it entirely; we participate therein." "The universe with all its laws and rationality *is* Christ, just as much as your body, your face, your speech, are you. The attraction of gravitation is only another name for Christ." These various forms of statement, being explanatory and elucidatory, show the positive form of the substantive monism set forth.

As to the *method* of God's production of the universe, thus of his own, and the only, substance, the statements are not absolutely explicit, nor always consistent. But the explanatory terminology is evolutionistic: "It would seem to follow, by logical necessity, that Christ is the principle of evolution." The statement: "Development, or evolution, is the product of free intelligence," is used to express the conception of "creation." "All things, all persons, all nations, all worlds, are only the partial, temporal graded unfoldings of a Being infinitely greater than they." All this agrees with the author's explicit statement: "I no longer conceive of the successive acts of creation as the bringing into being out of nothing of new substances that are outside of and different from God."

Explanations are given to show how this doctrine may be harmonized with the leading Christian doctrines. The possibility of *sin* is explained in the fact of "*finite personality*," into which "God has limited and circumscribed himself in giving life to finite personalities." Sin is declared to be "the act of the creature." It is said to have been "ordained." "He who ordained sin also ordained an atonement for sin and a way of escape from it." This is explained: "God ordains sin only in the sense of permitting it." Nevertheless it was his own "substance," as self-circumscribed, that sinned. The incarnation and atonement follow this view: "Christ's atonement is not made merely when he becomes incarnate and dies upon the cross. That outward and visible union with humanity which brings him to his sacrificial death is only the culmination and manifestation of a previous union with humanity which was constituted by creation, and which, from the very moment of man's sin, brought suffering to the Son of God." "It is impossible that he who is the natural life of humanity should *not* be responsible for the sin committed by his own members. It is impossible that he should *not* suffer, that he should *not* make reparation, that he should *not* atone. The incarnation and death of Christ are only the outward and temporal exhibition of an eternal fact in the being of God, and of a suffering for sin endured by the pre-incarnate Son of God ever since the fall. * * * Gethsemane and Calvary were concrete presentations of age-long facts: the fact, on the one hand, that holiness must punish sin; and the fact on the other hand, that he who gave his life to man at the beginning must share man's guilt and penalty. * * * The union of Christ with the race by the fact of creation explains not only the necessity of the atonement and its foundation in justice, but it also shows how the work of the great sin-bearer inures to the benefit of the race." The doctrine of the person of Christ is modified: "Christ is not distinguished from men in Scripture by being of a different substance from humanity, but rather by having that substance in its completeness and perfection. * * * He is the representative and ideal man, because he is the fully manifested God. Divinity and humanity are not mutually exclusive. * * * We

need now no complicated theory of the two natures and of the union between them. We have at the same time and in the same being complete and sinless humanity combined with suffering and atoning divinity."

Despite the plausibility of this elaborately framed theory of "Ethical Monism," we cannot but regard it as essentially misleading. The claim of Monism is far from assured. Even after the modifications here proposed it is beset with enormous difficulties. How much it stands apart from the natural interpretation of the Scriptures—the distinct clearness of which, when once reached, revolutionized the thought of the ancient world, overthrowing alike its pantheisms and its notion of the eternity of matter, and establishing the doctrine of God's creation of the material of cosmic structure out of nothing as the definite doctrine of Christianity—is witnessed to by the evident *strain* upon Dr. Strong to find any room or support for his theory. One cannot go through the discussion without the constant feeling that the plausibility of the presentation is due to the prevalent use of Scripture phrases and others whose bearing is vague and illusive and whose sense is utterly short of proof or just application to the real point in question—the identity of the *substance* of God and the world—as for example: "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations," "In him all things consist," "All things live and move and have their being in God," God is the "ground" all things, "the one and only principle of existence," all things "manifest God." Even the statements that "God is *above* all things, *in* all and *through* all," and that Christ fills "all" things made to do service for the theory, are in their exact thought, not monistic phraseology; for imminence in and through implies difference, not identity of substance.

Dr. Strong legitimately conserves the transcendence of God, and thereby also his personality, by maintaining that God in his free activity in creation has not exhausted his possibilities, and appears to avoid pantheism in the sense that "all things are God." But in making the *mode* of creation simply an energizing of his own substance under the forms of time and space, into all the realities of nature, certainly does not avoid but affirms pantheism in the sense that substantively "God is all" things. This, then, inexorably results in confounding the fundamental distinction, ever maintained by Christian theology between the divine "essence which is called and is God" and the essence which is not divine or God, between Being which is self-existent and eternal and being which originated. But more—the "dualism" of God and nature—which Dr. Strong concedes is fundamental in Christian theology, and cannot be given up—is everywhere through the Scriptures presented under forms of conception which imply a distinction too profound and emphatic to be regarded as but two forms or conditions of the same divine essence. And the "dualism" of mind and matter—also to be maintained—is not only too immovably established through the experi-

ence of mankind as a substantive difference, to be believed to be in fact a substantive identity; but the profoundest and most acute investigations of science, whether psychological or physical, have been unable either to find an identity beneath the duality, or to account for all the mental phenomena except upon a recognition of the view that "the mind" is a different essence (*substantia*) from the "matter" of the brain, and not merely a manifestation of that matter. Moreover, strange incongruities are inevitably developed in every attempt to think through this monistic process—God evolving his own substance into cosmic existence. It may be congruous if the ground and substance of the Absolute Being be conceived of as *impersonal*, to think of its fatalistic evolution into all the forms of the world's existence, provided, of course, that the impersonal energy be supposed to contain the principles of all. But to think of God as a *personal* Being, a spirit essence, freely evolving his own essence or substance, by depotentiation and circumscription, not only into all and each of the finite personalities of humanity, but into all and each of the material bodies or masses which constitute the physical universe, is, it appears to us, to accept incongruities of conception compared with which those, if there be any, of the standard understanding of the Biblical doctrine of absolute creation (*ex nihilo*) are small indeed. Especially so, since the very purpose of this "circumscription" included the bringing of the sphere of sin into the very substance of God, so as to make God himself in the person of Christ the Creator responsible for it. And the "responsibility" (pp. 35-37) being a moral one under the law of righteousness, the atoning suffering in redemption comes to bear the aspect, at least basally and primarily, of a just suffering owed to righteousness by the Creator himself, rather than a pure reality of love for redemption of guilty humanity. Indeed, if we take, in their literal force and fullness, the term "responsibility" and the statement that "he who gave his life to man at the beginning must share man's *guilt* and penalty, (*italics ours*), the view would seem to be in direct conflict with an element almost universally held to be fundamental to the *possibility* of a real atonement, viz: the absolute *innocence* of the sufferer. These are but hints of the difficulties inherent all through the scheme. Despite our admiration of the high ability of the author and of his loyal aim to serve Christianity, the very outcome of this effort to construct an adequate and consistent theory confirms our long established belief, that no monistic scheme has ever been or ever can be framed that can be legitimately sustained, either before the court of reason, where the realities of the universe are the witnesses, or in the court of Scripture, where the testimonies of revelation are to determine the view.

Besides the three essays which give the title to this volume, it contains a large number of papers, more or less connected with the initial subject, collected mostly from the author's contributions to philosophical and religious journals, together with twelve brief addresses to grad-

uating classes of the Theological Seminary. It was well to embody them in this permanent form. They deal ably with important questions and interests. Viewed as a contribution to the discussion of some of the great problems of our day in philosophy and theology, the volume is richly suggestive and very valuable.

M. VALENTINE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Messages of the Later Prophets: By Prof. Sanders, of Yale, and Prof. Kent, of Brown University. \$1.25.

This is the second of a series of twelve books known as "The Messages of the Bible." It embraces the prophecies of Obadiah, Isaiah, (second part), Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Joel and Jonah, and treats them in the order here given, which is claimed to be the natural order of time, and is the one generally approved by modern scholarship.

The book is not an ordinary commentary, but is a paraphrase aiming to reproduce in modern English the exact thought of the prophetic writer. Whatever view may be taken of the classification of the various prophets, certain it is that the paraphrase here furnished is a wonderful help in understanding their meaning. Any one who has endeavored to get at the exact sense of these admittedly difficult writings by means of the English Text alone, and who has afterwards availed himself of the help afforded by this paraphrase will be both surprised and delighted to see how much clearer their meaning has become to him. We have made the experiment repeatedly and as a consequence have formed a very high opinion of this little book as an aid to the better understanding of the Holy Scriptures and recommend its use to all who are concerned to know what the prophets have spoken.

The division of the material into sections, with explanatory headings, is another feature which all will appreciate.

E. HUBER.

Puritan Preaching in England. Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, 1899, Yale University. By John Brown, B. A., D. D. \$1.50.

In this volume a new turn is given to the Yale Lectures by following a historical, rather than a practical, line of development. In point of time the lectures extend from the efforts made by Charlemagne to encourage preaching to the work and methods of Alexander Maclaren. The term "Puritan" is not always used in its historical sense, as may be seen by the author's reference to Charlemagne, the preaching friars of the Middle Ages and John Colet, of Oxford; but he justifies his use of the word by including in the definition "those preachers who have laid more stress upon Scripture than upon ecclesiastical institutions."

The strict historical discussion of Puritanism begins with the third lecture, on the earlier Puritans, Chaderton, Culverwell, Perkins, Robinson, *et. al.* It is curious to learn how great was their influence on our history. Gov. Winthrop was converted under the preaching of Culver-

well, John Cotton and Robinson under Perkins ; and the importance of these three to the political and religious development of the U. S. needs no comment.

The fourth lecture, on the "Cambridge Platonists," discusses a side of Puritanism, of which very little is generally known. It is exceedingly interesting to read of the intellectual importance of Puritanism in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Such names as Whichcote, Cudworth, More, Smith, Patrick and Tillotson are not unknown in theological and philosophical literature. It is instructive, also, to study the attempt and failure of this school "to wed Christianity and philosophy."

The fifth and sixth lectures are character studies respectively of John Bunyan and Richard Baxter. People who have known these men by their writings alone will be surprised to learn how active and thorough they were in the pastoral relation. The lecture on Baxter has especial significance for the present. The Kidderminster pastor had strikingly modern views and methods.

Modern Puritanism is represented in the last three lectures by such men as Binney, Spurgeon, R. W. Dale and Alexander Maclaren. In these the historical element gives way to the practical ; and Dr. Brown has given a masterly discussion of ministerial activity in his examination of the careers of these men. But it must not be thought that even in the historical lectures the practical element has been overlooked. Throughout there are comments on the work and method of all the periods of Puritanism, and quotations from sermons and treatises on clerical duties.

This volume is by no means the least of those issued on the Beecher foundation. The historical idea introduced by it will add much to the efficiency of the series, if it is continued in future lectures. The abstract principles of homiletics have been so well presented in former volumes of this series that practically nothing remains to be said. But the historical teaching by example can make these principles more real by showing how they have stood the test of time and use, and how similar have been the elements of success for preachers of widely distant ages. Whoever reads this book cannot fail to be benefitted by it, and he will wish for more like it.

JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

A Problem in New Testament Criticism. The Stone Lectures for 1897-1898. By Melancthon W. Jacobus, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Hartford Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 285.

This is a book of the times and for the times. It could not have been produced ten years ago, and ten years hence much of it will be considered obsolete. That is, the questions it discusses had not loomed into prominence ten years ago, and ten years hence they are likely to have already assumed different phases from those they now present.

But it is good to have just such a book as this, and to have these questions so ably discussed in the light of the learning and philosophy of to-day.

This book shows that Dr. Jacobus is worthy to stand in the front rank of American students of New Testament Theology, and of New Testament Higher Criticism. The author has a minute and accurate acquaintance with the current literature of his subject, and a clear and philosophic insight into its logic and philosophy. But his judgment of the teaching of the New Testament is based on independent study of the New Testament itself. Indeed, we do not think that for a long time we have seen less second-hand learning in a book on any phase of theology.

The one characteristic of the book that impresses us with special force is the thought, developed at considerable length, that the entire problem of the New Testament Higher Criticism, that is, if the New Testament as a record, or as a supposed record and exposition, of a supernatural revelation, "goes back to philosophical lines." p. 22. Hence a solution of the problem must be sought in philosophy, rather than in history. It is the development of this thought that engages the author chiefly in the Introduction of twenty-six pages. He then discusses in order: The Preliminary Profit of the Method; The Problem of the Philosophy; Comparison of the Teachings of Jesus and Paul, pp. 133-229; The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Christian Unity.

The burden of the discussion rests on the "Comparison of the Teachings of Jesus and Paul," and it is here, in our judgment, that the chief strength and value of the book lie. In opposition to Wendt and others, our author insists and, we believe, proves that there is no fundamental difference between the teaching of Jesus, as reported in the Gospels, and the teaching of Paul in his Epistles. Here the main contention is that Christ stands at the beginning of the New Testament revelation, and Paul at its close. From the very nature of the case Christ could only hint at some things, as for instance, at his death, and its significance for redemption. Paul could magnify the fact of Christ's death, and could expound its significance from the data given by Christ. Hence "there is no strangeness in the differences between Christ and Paul. They are not differences that throw the Apostle out of doctrinal harmony with his Master. They are not Pharisaical peculiarities arbitrarily thrust athwart the teachings of Christ. In essence Jesus and Paul are at one." p. 176.

It is our judgment that the author, by a strictly inductive method of reasoning, sustains his contention with great force and ability, and in the most satisfactory manner reaches the conclusion that the teachings of the Apostles, Paul included, do not stand "in fatal disadjustment with that of the Master."

We believe the book will be welcomed by all students of New Testa-

ment Theology who have a fondness for the old paths, and who like that strictly scientific method which seeks to solve difficulties, rather than ignore them. The author also inspires confidence in his discussion by making it everywhere apparent that he does not claim to have solved the Problem of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament, but here makes his contribution in the direction of its solution.

J. W. RICHARD.

The Social Meaning of Modern Religious Movements in England.

Being the Ely Lectures for 1899. By Thomas C. Hall, D. D. 1900.
\$1.50.

The size of this work is in no proportion to its worth. This worth arises not only from the great importance of the religious movements it recalls, but especially from the clearness and force with which they are sketched, their connections shown, and their vast significance and lessons are pointed out.

The whole movement dates with the Wesleyan revival at Oxford. It answered to urgent needs in both the religious and social life of the times. Its progress is traced from its High-Church, but pietistic beginnings, through its wonderful extensions of awakened spiritual life and impelling consciousness of the obligations of righteousness in personal, social, communal, and civic. It was by no means a theological or dogmatic movement, but devotional, vitally ethical and practical. One of the notable showings of our author is how grandly, despite theological differences, the spiritual regeneration lifted the *Established Church itself* into a higher and diviner power of service in relation to all human interests and well-being, both social and political; so that through the alliance which united in common effort the evangelical party in the establishment, the Methodist schools and chapels and the Non-conformist and Puritan bodies, the total movement became the grandest effective power for victories of social reform—abolition of slavery and the slave-trade, protection of workmen and children from cruelty and wrong in factories, regulation of prisons, extension of suffrage, protection of rights, all the great ameliorations which have marked England's recent advance in freedom and conditions of human welfare. "That the social condition of England to-day is in its best and most lasting features because of the work of the great Evangelical leaders is capable of a demonstration."

Dr. Hall also notes the weaknesses of the movement, especially in its neglect of the doctrinal side of Christianity. In its intense absorption in the development of the Christian life and practical righteousness, it failed to provide needful safe-guard against the on-coming period of historical and Biblical criticism and other conflicts of speculative theology. Its relations to the liberalism of the Broad Church movement, represented in Arnold of Rugby, Hampton, Maurice, and Dean Stanley, and the High Church Oxford movement under Pusey, Newman, Froude,

and others, are traced and interpreted. We cannot agree with all the views of the author. But he has certainly made this book an interesting and instructive story of one of the most profound spiritual and social movements in Christian history, a story that exhibits in panoramic view a beneficent providence which conserved and forwarded the best welfare of the English people, and the interests that are lodged in their progress.

M. VALENTINE.

The Spirit and the Incarnation in the Light of Scripture, Science and Practical Need. By the Rev. W. L. Walker, Laurencekirk, (formerly Glasgow). T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. 8vo. pp. 388. \$3.50.

Inasmuch as the Preface of this book is dated "Congregational Manse," and for other reasons, we conclude that the author is a Congregational pastor. But the book itself deserves to be read both within and without the Congregational Church, because of its intrinsic merit. We can appreciate what the author means when he says that the book "represents much hard labor and not a little dearly bought experience." There is abundant evidence of diligent study of the Scriptures, of wide reading in modern theology and philosophy, and of an earnest search for the truth, such as is born of doubt, rather than of a traditional faith, but such as also persists until doubt is conquered.

The object of the book is two-fold: First, to show that the new and distinctive feature in Christianity is the doctrine of the Spirit; and secondly, that the Incarnation is the culmination of all the divine activity in the world—an ethical process, rather than a physical act, and resulting from God's immanence in the world.

The distinct personality of the Spirit is emphasized, and is made to appear as the predominant quality or characteristic of the Divine essence; though we are surprised to find that the author employs "it," and not "He," in referring to the Holy Spirit. He summarizes the first part of his work by saying "that the Holy Spirit, as the distinctive and abiding Reality in Christianity, is:

"1. The Spirit of God, the very essence of the Divine life, as that Spirit found its full expression or manifestation in the person and life and work of Christ.

"2. While the Spirit of God, and we with that Spirit in all its manifestations and workings, immanent and transcendent, it is *distinctively* that Spirit as it comes to us from the whole life and teaching, work and personality of Jesus Christ for our salvation or uplifting into the life of the sons of God.

"3. As such, it is an ethical Spirit of Holy Love, finding its expression in the Truth—above all, in the Truth concerning God in Christ, becoming also within us, as it possesses us, an illuminating, helping, sanctifying, strengthening, and saving Spirit.

"4. As it found its highest expression in the world in the personal

Christ, so it is in Him, as a living, abiding, personal, Divine-human Presence, that it is in its highest personal form with us and within us—at once the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, but coming to us in this Divine-human form through the Son, in whom the Spirit has entered into full possession of our humanity. 'His glorified Humanity is the very home and temple of the Spirit of God' (Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 146)." pp. 90, 91.

The relation of Christ to God is that of eternal Sonship, "an *essential* Sonship and the manifestation of something eternal in God. It is God in that aspect of His Being that may be best described as the Sonship becomes incarnate in Jesus Christ, and Christ had thus, in one side of his nature, not merely an ideal, but a real pre-existence in God." p. 226. This Sonship is based on a real distinction in the Divine nature—on the distinction "between God *in* Christ, and God in his transcendency, or 'the Father,' as Christ stood in conscious relation to him." The distinction made by the author is very acute. It may not do full justice to the reality, either of Fatherhood, or of Sonship. But as conceived by the author the distinction is a real one, is personal.

The Incarnation, which is the manifestation of God, is a gradual process, a continuous entering of God into humanity, very God and very man, "born, growing, suffering, dying," having "a Divine-human consciousness." The Incarnation cannot be accounted for by the theory of *Kenosis*, but must be regarded as the process of God's *self-manifestation* to the world, an *Eternal Kenosis*, not the result of physical processes, but rather of an ethical development through the Spirit—which implies of course that the Eternal Son would have become incarnate, even had there been no sin. Yet his Incarnation, suffering, death and resurrection, serve to deliver humanity from sin.

The doctrine of *the Christian Trinity*—there is an ontological as well as an economic Trinity—is thus presented: "*The Father* is God as the Source of all that is or can be: *the Son* is God as He exists to and for Himself, as He goes out from Himself in obedience to His nature of Perfect Love into the world, to create, and spread abroad the Divine Life and Blessedness in this Sonship realized in finite beings; and as he realizes that Sonship in human form, and returns to Himself and the Divine-human Christ: *the Holy Spirit* is God in His innermost being or essence, the principle of the life of both Father and Son; that in which God, both as Father and as Son, does everything, and in which He comes to us and is in us increasingly through His manifestations." p. 337.

The book taken as a whole presents an effort to restate the doctrine of the Trinity, and to bring it into closer harmony with the accepted principles of modern philosophy and with scientific conclusions. We are far from thinking that the author has perfectly succeeded, nor does he flatter himself with the thought that he has removed all the mysteries

surrounding the doctrine of *the Christian Trinity*. At places he seems to press "the Divine Unity" at the expense of "*the Christian Trinity*." But this is less objectionable, we conceive, than so to press the distinction of persons in the Trinity, as to expose the Trinitarian conception of God to the allegation of being tritheistic. We are not to forget that in treating this profound and mysterious subject of three persons in one Divine Essence, it is hard to steer equally distant from Scylla and Charybdis.

While not endorsing all that the book contains, we nevertheless hail it as a valuable contribution to theological science, and as a step conscientiously taken in the direction of a more practical treatment of the doctrine of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. A thoughtful preacher will be able to fashion many of its discussions into material for the pulpit.

J. W. RICHARD.

Can I Believe in God the Father? By Wm. Newton Clark, D. D. pp. 215. \$1.00.

This little book has already been so widely and deservedly praised that further notice of it seems unnecessary. It takes up the old question of the Being of God and without ignoring or underrating the well known arguments, presents the subject in the light of the modern spirit. In view of our present scientific knowledge and the philosophy of to-day, the author asks, Can I Believe in God the Father? The answer is very strongly affirmative. Dr. Clark shows very plainly that the recent discoveries and theories of science instead of weakening the argument for the existence of God have rather strengthened it. Many of our young men, and especially ministers, in laudable zeal to defend the truth, have hastened to denounce some of the teachings of to-day without understanding them fully. Without going into details Dr. Clark shows how the additions to our knowledge of the laws of the universe make the belief in God more necessary than ever before. Ministers will find this book one of the very best to put into the hands of men who are perplexed by the apparent conflict between the religion they have believed and the conception of the universe they have gained from other sources. It is calculated to strengthen one's faith and to make doubting men breathe more freely in a world filled with the spirit of God. They will learn as the author himself says in the last sentence of the book, that "the mightiest moral force in the world is God himself, working for the fulfillment of his own gracious counsel for his human family."

D. W. WOODS, JR.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines? By Washington Gladden. \$1.25.

It has rarely been our pleasure to read a more stimulating, or, in many respects, more satisfactory, little volume than is this last from the

pen or Dr. Gladden. We can say this without by any means approving of all the positions he has taken.

The title would perhaps lead one to expect a radical treatment of the old doctrines; but from beginning to end there is a reverence displayed in the discussion that convinces one, not only that the author is not imbued with the iconoclastic spirit, but that he is a man of genuine faith and rich experience.

The preface opens with a statement that the book is "not for the scholars, but for the people." Right here we would take our first point of issue. What may be a good book for those who are prepared to read it discriminatingly, may be a very dangerous book for those who are not able to discriminate. To use the author's words, there is a very large class of readers "of untrained intellect, who can think of only two statements which can be made about any question, the one of which shall be the exact antithesis of the other," and no amount of guarding and explanation can make them see otherwise. A thing is either "orthodox," conforming to the old established formulas in every particular, or it is "heretical;" and to unsettle their belief in the old statements of truth, is to unsettle their belief in the truth itself. "*How Much is Left*" is a book for those who can *think*, and for no others; but for them it is a helpful and valuable book.

Much of the matter in the earlier chapters, however it may diverge from the old forms of theological statement, has become theological commonplace in these later days, yet however familiar it may be we are gratified to see it so aptly put.

One cannot read these chapters without being impressed anew with the wide distinction which may exist between mere orthodoxy of statement, and the real essence of orthodoxy. A great many present day difficulties lie in a vain endeavor to bind living thought in the expressions and formulas of the Middle Ages, instead of dressing the essential truth, which the old doctrines embodied, in modern garb. This has been the effort of the author, and it is a satisfaction to see how, in every case, his conclusion plants him squarely on the evangelical basis.

The chapters on the Trinity, The Word Made Flesh, and How Christ Saves Men, leave something to be desired in clearness of expression, yet even in these, what at first seems out of harmony with accepted is more a matter of statement, than of rejection of what is fundamental.

The Sacraments seem to be robbed entirely of special spiritual grace, and in the discussion of the Lord's Supper he repeats the old charge that the Lutheran Church teaches consubstantiation. His final view of this sacrament is practically that of Zwingli.

Through the entire volume there is either a very loose use of the word "Reformed" in referring to the churches, or else, as seems more probable from his failure to notice diverging Lutheran teachings on important points, an unfortunate lack of acquaintance with Lutheran theology.

The theory of the book is consistently evolutionary: and with that as a premise, a strong argument for the immortality of the soul has been constructed.

Taken as a whole, "What is left" is a strong book, admirably adapted to the needs of the thought of the times. It gives a practical, commonsense, yet reverent and devout view of the Christian faith, that will do good among thinking laymen, as well as among clergymen. Its tendency is conservative, rather than otherwise. It is a book to be welcomed.

EDGAR GRIM MILLER.

The Atlantic Monthly for April is an unusually strong number, and it is indeed "Devoted to Literature, Science, Art and Politics." College men will turn to it with interest to read the very bright paper on "The Perplexities of a College President," and they will all with one accord wish that—as is almost without exception the case in the *Atlantic*—the writer had bravely attached his name to his paper. Politicians will be on the *qui vive* for the second paper on "The Political Horizon." Then the reader who is in search of choice fiction will be charmed with "Maud Evelyn" and "Penny Wise." There are a number of strong papers on such subjects as "The Consular Service of the United States," "The Forests of the Yosemite," "A Comic Chesterfield," "Coöperation in the West," and "A Great Modern Spaniard." "Birds of Passage," "The Childhood of Louis XIII," and "Autobiography of W. J. Stillman." There are some poems that are very beautiful, particularly "An Acadian Easter." The Contributors' Club is devoted to Recollections of Ruskin.

This is such a valuable number that no reader of good literature can afford to do without it.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

A History of New Testament Times in Palestine. By Shaler Mathews, Prof. of New Testament History is the University of Chicago. 75 cents.

This volume belongs to a contemplated series of New Testament Hand Books whose aim is stated to be to "present briefly and intelligibly the results of the scientific study of the New Testament. Each volume is to cover its own field and is intended for the general reader as well as for the special student."

This one of the series deals with the period in the history of the Jewish people, which is included between the time of Alexander the Great and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Some of the subjects that are discussed in the book are the following: the troubles in the reign of the Seleucidae—the Maccabean struggles for religious freedom—the conquest of Judea by the Romans—the Roman rule in Palestine—the Herodian family—the Messianic Hope and Jesus the Messiah—the Fall of Judea and the rise of the Christian Church.

Any one who has ever undertaken in good earnest to get a thorough understanding of the Four Gospels has found out by experience that a knowledge of the terms in which the events narrated occurred is essential thereto. Just such information is furnished in the book now under consideration—in a clear and comprehensive manner—by a writer whose ability is beyond question. We do not hesitate to express a most favorable judgment concerning the merits of this work and know that its diligent use will help to a better comprehension of the facts in the life of Jesus Christ as given by the four Evangelists. E. HUBER.

O. N. NELSON AND CO., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

History of the Scandinavians and Successful Scandinavians in the United States. Compiled and Edited by O. N. Nelson. Vols. I and II. Second, Revised Edition. pp. 518 and 280.

The Scandinavians have long been recognized as among our most desirable immigrants. Characterized as they are by industry, frugality, excellent family life, promotion of education, respect for religion, and patriotic devotion to their adopted country, they constitute a class of citizens most helpful to the maintenance of law and order as well as to the material progress of our land. The story of these people is well told in this book, and the reader's good opinion of the Scandinavians will become still better, even though he make due allowance for the fact that the author is giving us the history and portraying the virtues of those to whom he himself is bound by the close ties of kindred and nationality.

Ten years of unremitting labor have been devoted to the preparation of this history, and no effort has been spared to make it trustworthy. Its statistics are very complete and, so far as we can see, thoroughly reliable. Another important feature is its bibliography of Scandinavian-American historical literature, which will be specially acceptable to those making a further study of these people.

The chapter on the "Nationality of Criminal and Insane Persons in the United States," deserves special mention not only for its special interest and value but also for the good showing it makes for the Scandinavians. Of the criminal class they furnish the smallest percentage, and of the insane their percentage is also the smallest with one exception—the Irish. We notice that the Irish have the distinction of furnishing the highest percentage of criminal and the lowest percentage of insane. (pp. 17 and 18 of Vol. II.) This chapter has received high praise from specialists.

We are tempted to quote from what is said on the subject of proselyting among these people, especially by the Methodists and Baptists, but we forbear. The waste of money by these denominations to win over these Lutheran people is enormous, to say nothing of their Phariseism in such work.

We only wish a work of such excellence in contents had been given a more substantial binding. But the reader may possibly excuse this in view of its more important merits.

P. M. BIKLE.

LITTLE, BROWN AND CO., BOSTON.

The Puritan as Colonist and Reformer. By Ezra Hoyt Byington. \$2.00.

The Puritan as Colonist and Reformer is a delightfully readable book. Its broad margins and clear print attract one before a word is read, while the style of the author, as he tells an interesting story interestingly, holds one from the first page to the last.

The first two hundred pages deal wholly with the Pilgrim and Puritan as Colonists. The influences leading to the settlement of New England, the development of the various colonies, their difficulties and successes, their customs and peculiarities, their relations with the English Crown and with the Indians, and the growth of the idea of freedom are all depicted with a fullness and vividness that is both satisfactory and enjoyable.

The chapter on John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians, traces a phase of missionary labor too little known, and too little understood. The treatment of Jonathan Edwards, and of the Puritan character, brings to light the brighter and more admirable, and less well known sides, of both, while the harsher and repellant elements of their doctrine and life, though acknowledged and deplored both in fact and consequence, are glossed over by a loving hand.

The portrait of the times, people, motives and doctrines, is painted true to life, but painted from the angle that shows most of the beauties and least of the defects.

The book is admirable as a history, and full of value and suggestion for those who look beyond the mere succession of events for the development of the thoughts and motives that give direction and meaning to those events.

EDGAR GRIM MILLER.

GENERAL COUNCIL BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

Beacon Lights. A Series of Short Sermons. Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D. pp. 539.

This volume comprises fifty-nine short sermons covering the entire cycle of the Christian year. The sermons have been selected from the author's pulpit ministrations. "They have all been preached, and are here given as preached." They have the charm of a simple and lucid style, voicing the gospel in the plainest, strongest and most direct way, and setting before the mind the fundamental truths of Christianity without the glosses and the rhetorical expedients of special pleading. The volume is meant to illustrate the author's conviction "that the supernatural elements in our holy religion, and not its mere ethical teachings,

constitute its characteristic life and only saving power." He has been faithful to his task; and while the author must himself admit that his scope by no means exhausts the rich field of Christian truth, his claim that the pulpit wins its highest dignity in the emphasis given to these elemental truths will readily be granted. The sermons are deeply devotional in cast, enriched by apt quotations from the best hymns. They will fill a place in the home, and add to the author's reputation as a sound gospel preacher.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD, 1308 ARCH STEET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Infant Baptism, Normal to the Gospel: An Argument. By Rev. H. King, of Somerset, Pa. Price 5 cents in lots, or 10 cents, sample copies. Can also be procured from the author.

We have read with much interest and profit Rev. H. King's booklet on *Infant Baptism*. It is a work which is orderly in its arrangement, perspicuous in style, logical in argument, and overwhelming in its conclusions. Waiving some points which others have regarded as essential in the discussion, the author at once plunges into the heart of his theme. The exclusion of infants from baptism is illogical. He puts his syllogism in the following form:

The "door" of the fold is open to all the members of the race:

Children are members of the race:

Therefore "the door" is open for children.

If the first proposition of the syllogism can be proved, the conclusion that the door is open for children, will, of course, be a demonstration. But is the door open for all? This is what Jesus Christ, who is the door, has commanded us to preach. To deny this would be to make God a liar, because it would be disbelieving the record which God gave of his son. The race is born without the fall. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Every natural birth must have a spiritual birth to enter the kingdom of God. But if the door is open to all, it must be open at the beginning of every natural life. The proposition is reasonable, because the gospel is equal in scope to the effects of the fall. Here Anabaptists meet the two horns of the dilemma: either children are morally pure and need no regeneration, or they have natural depravity and must be born again. To say that children are morally pure at natural birth and are not in need of regeneration, is contrary to experience and the Scriptures. To say they need regeneration is to admit the proposition that *Infant Baptism is normal to the gospel*.

It is the position which Drs. Martensen, Dorner, Luthardt and Schaff take in the discussion of *Infant Baptism*. Children are susceptible to the divine grace, which is offered and found in their baptism. We must all come to this if the race is to start normally in the way of salvation.

P. BERGSTRESSER.